Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-220
Wednesday
14 November 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-220 *14 November 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

NATO Generals Continue Visit, Meet Leaders 1
Paper on Yazov, Moiseyev Talks *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Nov]* 1
Visit Taman Guards *[Moscow Radio]* 1
Meet Military Academy Officials *[TASS]* 2
Meet With Gorbachev *[TASS]* 2
Hold News Conference *[TASS]* 2
Galvin on Gorbachev Meeting *[TASS]* 2
Petrovskiy Views Future UN Role *[Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE SONDAG 11 Nov]* 3
World Trade Unions Federation Council Meets *[TASS]* 3
Conference on European Change Opens in Lisbon *[TASS]* 4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Joint U.S. Military Conversion Roundtable Held *[TASS]* 5
U.S., Philippines To Scrap 1947 Bases Agreement *[TASS]* 5
Soviet Delegation Observes U.S. Voting Methods *[TASS]* 6

China

Picketers Protest Outside PRC Embassy in Moscow *[Moscow International]* 6
Chinese Editor's Moscow Visit Detailed *[Moscow International]* 6
Official Gives Impressions of Visit to PRC *[Moscow International]* 7
University Awards Doctorate to PRC Scientist *[Moscow International]* 7

Northeast Asia

Consultations With DPRK Held in Pyongyang *[TASS]* 8
USSR, South Korea Establish Direct Sea Links *[IZVESTIYA 11 Nov]* 8
Japan 'Hampering' Economic Aid to USSR *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* 9
Lukyanov Talks With Japanese Officials, Quayle *[TASS]* 9

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Cambodian Settlement Talks Continue 9
9 Nov Pyongyang Talks Noted *[Moscow International]* 9
Rogachev Attends Jakarta Talks *[TASS]* 10
Burma Seeks To Rejoin Nonaligned Movement *[Moscow International]* 11

Near East & South Asia

Belonogov, Petrovskiy Conduct Mideast, Gulf Tour *[IZVESTIYA 14 Nov]* 12
Primakov Interviewed on Mideast Crisis Resolution *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 45]* 12
Syrian Stance on Gulf, U.S. Buildup Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 14 Nov]* 16
TASS Summarizes Persian Gulf Developments 16
Effect of Gulf Crisis on Saudi Life Viewed *[PRAVDA 9 Nov]* 17
Prospects for Broader Saudi Ties Foreseen *[PRAVDA 13 Nov]* 18
Iran's Position on Iraq Remains Unchanged *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 19

18,000 Soviet Jews Seek Return From Israel *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 31 Oct]* 20
IZVESTIYA Interviews Afghan President *[10 Nov]* 20
Foreign Ministry Collegium Eyes Afghan POW Issue *[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]* 22
Pakistani President Cited on Ties With Neighbors *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Nov]* 22
Ryzhkov Congratulates New Pakistani Premier *[TASS]* 22
Gorbachev Receives Sudanese Envoy's Credentials *[Khartoum SUNA]* 22

East Europe

Yakovlev Receives Bulgarian President *[TASS]* 22
CSFR Premier Speaks on Border Relations *[Moscow Radio]* 23
Talks Held on Troop Withdrawal From CSFR *[TASS]* 23

West Europe

Shevardnadze Lauds Gorbachev's FRG Visit *[Berlin ADN]* 23
FRG Said To Establish Economic Links *[TASS]* 24
Reports, Comments View Soviet-German Treaty 24
Genscher Interviewed *[TASS]* 24
Sitaryan Views Cooperation *[Moscow TV]* 25
Treaty's Effects Examined *[Bovin in IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]* 26
PRAVDA Reports Soviet-FRG News Conference *[11 Nov]* 27
Berlin Mayor Interviewed Prior to Moscow Visit *[PRAVDA 12 Nov]* 30
Berlin Mayors Visit To Establish Direct Ties 31
Arrive 11 Nov *[Berlin ADN]* 31
Meet With Popov, Falin *[TASS]* 32
Sign Friendship Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 32
Meet With Kvitninskiy 13 Nov *[TASS]* 32
Hold Joint News Conference *[Berlin ADN]* 32
Mayors Hail USSR-FRG Treaty *[TASS]* 33
TASS Previews 'Historic' Soviet-Italian Treaty 33
CPSU's Dzasokhov Visits Madrid Socialist Congress 33
Meets Spanish Leaders *[PRAVDA 11 Nov]* 33
Comments on Similarities *[Moscow TV]* 34

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Reconvenes 14 Nov; Agenda Reviewed *[TASS]* 35

Political & Social

Gerasimov Replaced as Foreign Ministry Spokesman *[TASS]* 35
Spokesman Comments on Yeltsin-Gorbachev Meeting *[TASS]* 35
Hijacker Held After Hijack Attempt Foiled *[TASS]* 36
Attempt to Import Pistols, Tear Gas Fails *[IZVESTIYA 11 Nov]* 36
MVD Aide Reviews Progress in Weapons Seizures
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Nov] 36
Moscow TV Clarifies 'Inaccuracy' in Kryuchkov Item *[Moscow TV]* 36
Further on Kryuchkov Talks *[KOMOSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Nov]* 37
Democratic Platform To Set Up New Political Party *[TASS]* 37
Yeltsin's, Popov's 7 Nov Sincerity Questioned *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Nov]* 37
Ligachev Linked to Cover-Up of Mass Grave *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 45]* 38
Radio, TV Chairman on 'Democratized' Programming *[Moscow International]* 41

Economic

Consumer Protection Regulations To Be Enacted *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* 41
Gosbank Policy Said To Undermine Gorbachev Decree *[IZVESTIYA 11 Nov]* 42
Shipment Problems Blamed for Sugar Shortages *[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]* 43

Perm Food Situation Termed 'Explosive' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Nov]* 43
Workers Protest Lost Jobs at Rostov Nuclear Plant *[Moscow TV]* 45
Lenin Auto Plant To Expand Through Sale of Stock *[Moscow TV]* 45
Bashkiriya Plant Gears Up To Produce Fiat Cars *[Moscow TV]* 46
'Militarized' Udmurt Faces Conversion Problems *[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]* 46
Importance of Increasing Output Stressed *[PRAVDA 9 Nov]* 46
New Steel Complex Starts Up in Magnitogorsk *[Moscow TV]* 47

Agricultural

Cities Favor Land Sale More Than Countryside *[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]* 48
Leukosis Spread Exposes Veterinary Standards *[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]* 48

Scientific

Mir Cosmonauts' Situation Updated *[TASS]* 49
Citizens Protest Novaya Zemlya Nuclear Test *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Parasitic Disease Figures Understated *[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]* 49

Military

'Shield' Leader Says Yazov Resignation Imminent *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 50
Gorbachev Addresses Servicemen 13 Nov *[Moscow Radio]* 50
Army Asks for Help in Relations With Republics *[IZVESTIYA 14 Nov]* 55
Akhromeyev Asserts Army's Defense of Constitution *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Nov]* 56
Problems With Fall Draft in Belorussia Detailed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Nov]* 59

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Baltic Council To Reconvene 17 November *[Vilnius International]* 61
Baltic States Seek Recognition in CFE Treaty *[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]* 61
Estonia Appeals for Treaty Mention *[TASS]* 61
Lithuania Issues Statement on Moscow Talks *[TASS]* 61
Prunskiene Address on Statement *[Vilnius Radio]* 61
Poll Measures Lithuanian Leaders' Popularity *[Vilnius International]* 63
Lithuania To Issue Passports for Foreign Travel *[IZVESTIYA 11 Nov]* 63
CSFR Envoy Clarifies Accord With Lithuania *[IZVESTIYA 10 Nov]* 64
'Intolerance' Shown in Vilnius 7 Nov Deplored *[IZVESTIYA 10 Nov]* 64
Burokevicius Appeals Against Monument Destruction *[TASS]* 64
Lithuanian Poles' Autonomy Moves Explained *[PRAVDA 11 Nov]* 65
Latvia Drafting Bill on Protecting Borders *[TASS]* 66
Latvia Planning Realignment *[Moscow International]* 66
Jurvala Gorkom, City Officials Clash Over Office *[TASS]* 66
Paper Views Clash *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 13 Nov]* 67
Latvian Supreme Soviet's Survival Questioned *[SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH 16 Oct]* 67
Riga Government Protests Garrison 7 Nov Acts *[Riga International]* 68
Estonian-RSFSR Treaty Under Discussion *[Moscow International]* 69
Estonian Women Protest 'Soaring' Prices *[TRUD 7 Nov]* 69
Yeltsin Chairs Draft Constitution Commission *[TASS]* 69
'Jury' To Choose Constitution by 1 Jan 1991 *[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]* 70
RSFSR Law on Sovereignty's Economic Base *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Nov]* 70
Enabling Resolution *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Nov]* 71
Leningrad City Council Studying Rationing *[AFP]* 72
Moscow City Soviet Discusses Market Transition 72
Paper Views Session Agenda *[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]* 72
Popov Speech Cited *[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]* 72
Plans To Privatize Distribution *[TASS]* 73
Foreign Minister Meets U.S. Religious Figures *[TASS]* 74
Andreyev Views Economic Council Competence *[Moscow Radio]* 74

Presidential Rule Advantages Examined *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 44]* 74
Pickets Disrupt Air Traffic in Petrozavodsk *[Moscow TV]* 77
Three MVD Soldiers Desert Omsk With Weapons *[TASS]* 77
Deserters Recaptured *[PRAVDA 11 Nov]* 77

Western Republics

No Consensus on Moldovan Resolution *[TASS]* 77
Luchinskiy Calls Situation 'Paradox' *[Moscow TV]* 78
Moldova MVD Chief Unreachable During Shootings *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 24 Nov]* 78
Paper Carries Appeals for Compromise *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA 25 Oct]* 79
Ukraine Seeks CSCE Observer Status *[IZVESTIYA 10 Nov]* 80
Ukrainian Legislature Discusses Ownership Bill *[TASS]* 80
Paper Reports Kravchuk 26 Oct News Conference *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 28 Oct]* 81
Rukh Chairman Drach Interviewed on Prospects *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 7 Nov]* 82
Lvov Protestors Seek Cathedral Lands' Return *[Kiev International]* 83
Ukrainian Official on Chernobyl Disaster *[Budapest MAGYAR NEMZET 10 Nov]* 83
Ukraine on 'Operation Visla' Condemnation *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 12 Oct]* 84

Caucasus

'Major Changes' Awaited in Georgian Government *[TASS]* 85
Gamsakhurdiya Elected President *[TASS]* 85
Paper on Political Alignment After Georgia Poll *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Nov]* 85
Georgian Army Society Changes Name, Purpose *[Moscow Radio]* 86
Armenia Abolishes People's Control Committee *[Moscow Radio]* 86
Yerevan Paper Sees Bleak Future for Armenia *[HAYASTAN 25 Oct]* 86
Armenian Nationalist Leader Returns to Yerevan *[Yerevan Radio]* 87
To Address Rally *[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]* 87
News Agency Expanding Ties With Diaspora *[ARMENPRES]* 87
Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan Meets Catholicos *[Yerevan Radio]* 87
CP Criticized For Opposing Depoliticization *[Yerevan Radio]* 88

NATO Generals Continue Visit, Meet Leaders

Paper on Yazov, Moiseyev Talks

PM1311233790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Meeting at USSR Defense Ministry"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] On 12 November there was a meeting between Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister, and General V. Eide, chairman of NATO's military committee, and General J. Galvin, NATO's supreme allied commander in Europe. During the conversation they discussed problems of strengthening international security as well as the possibility of expanding and deepening military contacts. They also examined questions of mutual relations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. It was noted that these relations are beginning to be built on new foundations conducive to the solution of crisis situations.

Taking part in the conversation were Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, Army General P.G. Lushev, commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact states' Joint Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister, and other officials.

R.Q. Braithwaite, British ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

On the same day Army Gen. M.A. Moiseyev met with Gen. V. Eide and Gen. J. Galvin.

Gens. Eide and Galvin visited the Taman Guards' Motorized Rifle Division, where they familiarized themselves with the Soviet servicemen's living conditions and day-to-day existence and inspected samples of combat hardware and armaments.

Army Gen. M.A. Moiseyev gave a dinner in honor of the eminent guests.

Visit Taman Guards

LD1211182290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] The immense changes that are taking place on the European continent are borne out, in particular, by the visit to our country by the high-ranking representatives of NATO, General Galvin, supreme allied commander Europe, and General Eide, chairman of the NATO Military Committee. Today they made a trip to the environs of Moscow, to Alabino, where the Taman Guards Motorized Rifle Division is stationed. Our correspondent Aleksandr Korshunov was also there.

[Korshunov] Over the several years of perestroyka we have already become fully accustomed to the epithet: first; but the current visit by Messrs Eide and Galvin is indeed a first. Never before have the chairman of the Military Committee and supreme commander of NATO been in the Soviet Union. At the Taman Division today they inspected examples of the armaments and battle equipment of Soviet ground troops. A real exhibition was organized on the division parade ground. There was the T-72 tank with reactive armor, the BMP-2, the motor rifle troops' main combat vehicle, all types of artillery, engineering and special vehicles, and firearms from pistols to automatic grenade launchers. In the sports hall the soldiers and NCO's of a reconnaissance company of one of the regiments demonstrated their combat skills to the guests. Afterwards, I had a chance to talk to the the NATO supreme allied commander Europe, General Galvin. He began with this amiable phrase:

It is very interesting and simply agreeable for me to take the opportunity, granted for the first time, of watching the Soviet Army at close quarters, and even, I would say, from inside. And in itself this particular circumstances confirms that the times of confrontation are passing away, and an era of cooperation is beginning. The main argument in favor of such a conclusion is, after all, the specific content of the conversations between NATO representatives and our Soviet colleagues. We have already touched on an important subject with the leadership of the Defense Ministry and General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, namely, the Soviet Army's new defensive concept which has been given the name doctrine of defensive sufficiency. We have managed to gain a great deal of new and useful information, and I am still under the impression of the level of openness which typifies our discussions. In general, I have to note, says Gen Galvin, that I am trying rather to listen here than speak.

Replying to a question from your correspondent as to the meaning, in practice, of the transformation of NATO's nature, General Galvin said:

I think that first of all it means peace. An important theme was and is the future that awaits us, I mean NATO, the Soviet Union, and the other countries of the Warsaw Pact. I believe that soon, John Galvin continues, a treaty will be signed on substantial cuts in conventional weapons and troops in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, and this introduces an entirely new factor into the whole customary picture of relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. As you know, a statement was made at the summit meeting of NATO leaders in London on a change in the essence of the North Atlantic bloc. If we take a close look at the military budgets of the NATO countries, then we can see that they are being reduced. In many cases the numbers of troops is also being cut. For example, the U.S. Army in Europe will be reduced by 40,000 men by next year. About 100 U.S. bases and military facilities are due for closure. The transformation of the two blocs in Europe, I repeat, means peace, security, and progress to a more stable future, even in spite of the challenges we are encountering, say, in the Persian Gulf, a region located alongside Europe, said Gen Galvin, NATO supreme allied commander, Europe.

It remains for me to add that the visit by the NATO representatives will last several days more, and

tomorrow Gen Eide and Gen Galvin are addressing the students and supreme command of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff Academy.

Meet Military Academy Officials

LD1311140890 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] General Vigleik Eide, chairman of NATO's Military Committee, today explained the alliance's history, structure and strategy to Soviet military leaders.

Eide, who is here on an official visit, was speaking to members of the Soviet General Staff, Defence Ministry and the staffs of different arms of the services.

He said he was on the whole satisfied with how the attitude to the Soviet Union and its policies were changing on the part of the NATO military leadership. That included, he said, "more understanding and less suspicion".

The West, Eide said, recognised the positive changes in the Soviet Armed Forces, in particular those helping to maintain defences at reasonably sufficient levels. He said that NATO would also undergo reorgasation. Revealing related plans, he said that armed forces would be cut but also made more mobile, although without posing a threat to others.

Eide did not rule out possible East-West talks to reduce NATO's naval forces.

Meanwhile, General John Galvin, Supreme Allied Commander Europe, visited the Soviet General Staff's military academy, the main school for higher command, to get an idea of how studies there are organised and talk to students.

Eide and Galvin later placed a wreath to the tomb of the unknown soldier at the Kremlin Wall.

They are to meet President Gorbachev this afternoon.

Meet With Gorbachev

LD1311174990 Moscow TASS in English 1735 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 13 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev received in the Kremlin today Chairman of NATO's Military Committee Vigleik Eide and the alliance's Supreme Commander in Europe John Galvin.

The meeting was a concrete manifestation of the favourable impact of new thinking on world affairs and major changes in Europe, including the military field. "It is in this spirit that I meet you," the president said.

Eide and Galvin agreed with the president's analysis.

They had a friendly, frank conversation which focused on issues connected with the creation of a new security model, based on general European structures, and the role and place of the two military-political alliances in dealing with this important task.

It was specially stressed that the development of partnership and trust between them helps forge a favourable atmosphere for the forthcoming summit conference in Paris, which will mark a milestone in Europe's history.

Gorbachev briefly dwelt upon Soviet miltiary reform, stemming from international developments and restructuring in the Soviet Union, and noted that the West should also move more energetically along the road of reform, which was proclaimed in the London declaration.

NATO generals assured Gorbachev that their countries, responding to impressive changes in the USSR, are also preparing for major changes in the military field.

As the international situation changes, certain modifications are introduced into the structure and goals of the Armed Forces which must play their positive role in getting things changed as compared with the past, Gorbachev said.

Hold News Conference

LD1411151490 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow November 13 TASS—Chairman of NATO's Military Council General Vigleik Eide told a news conference here today that his meeting with journalists at the Soviet Foreign Ministry's press center was an illustration of the changing times.

Eide and NATO Supreme Allied Commander General John Galvin told a news conference here about the results of their visit to the Soviet Union.

Eide told correspondents that he and his colleague had very open and productive meetings with Soviet political and military leaders and were looking forward to continuing contacts on the basis of the spirit of cooperation.

At present, he went on to say, the entire situation, the security environment is changing from confrontation to cooperation.

"In line with these changes, we need numerous contacts involving various groups of people, including the military, which is of great importance," Eide said.

Galvin on Gorbachev Meeting

LD1311151990 Moscow TASS in English 1451 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow November 13 TASS—General John Galvin, NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe, praised President Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with NATO military leaders here today. He and General Vigleik Eide, chairman of the NATO Military Committee, are on an official visit to the USSR.

"We had a very good meeting with President Gorbachev," Galvin told a news conference at the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Press Centre today.

"This was my first meeting with the Soviet president," Galvin said. "I left with a feeling that I had met a courageous man with a broad outlook".

Galvin wished President Gorbachev and all Soviet people success in restructuring Soviet society and noted that "although there is a difficult path ahead, the Soviet Union is proceeding in the right direction". He expressed confidence that the Soviet people "will accomplish the set tasks".

Petrovskiy Views Future UN Role

PM1311164590 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE SONDAG in Danish 11 Nov 90 p 15

[Report on interview with USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy by Flemming Rose in Moscow; date not given: "The United Nations Should Be a Military Fire-Fighting Force"]

[Text] Moscow—The changes in the world are so great and so profound that we cannot understand the so-called new world order by using the concepts we used in the past. When the world's first computer specialists began to create their own language, they chose to invent words and expressions which did not give rise to associations with the established natural sciences. It is the same with the new world order. A qualitatively new situation in the world is coming into being, and we have to find new concepts to be able to describe it. Things began in Europe and in the Soviet Union, but they will not end here. Current developments will change the whole world.

These are the views of Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy, who compared the UN Charter to a sleeping beauty being woken by the countries of the world with 159 warm kisses on the lips. According to Petrovskiy the current Middle East crisis has shown that there are enormous untapped reserves hidden in the UN Charter.

"In the past individual countries attached importance to individual articles in the UN Charter, but today all are agreed that from A through Z the Charter guarantees the interests of all countries," Petrovskiy said in an exclusive interview with BERLINGSKE TIDENDE SONDAG.

The 57-year-old Vladimir Petrovskiy is one of the central architects behind the Soviet Union's new foreign policy. Petrovskiy is said to have set his own personal stamp on the Soviet Union's new attitude to the United Nations and other multinational nations [as published] in the foreign policy arena. He is also the source of many of Gorbachev's most important foreign policy speeches. Petrovskiy has been deputy foreign minister since May 1986.

Petrovskiy predicts that in the future the United Nations will form the framework for comprehensive military cooperation between member nations. "The military involvement of individual countries will devolve onto a UN army, which will not only be ready to turn out in the event of a conflagration but will also prevent conflagrations from starting—that is, it will prevent aggression and armed conflicts. In this connection I view the recent meeting of the deputy chiefs of staff of the five permanent members of the Security Council as a very important first step in this direction," Petrovskiy said, adding that with its initiatives in the Middle East crisis Denmark has shown the way to other small countries which want to make their contribution to the establishment of a new world order.

The Soviet deputy foreign minister views the Kuwait crisis as the decisive touchstone on the road to the new world order.

"The situation is tragic and full of drama, but as in the rest of life it is psychological shocks and tragic events like these which lay the foundation for new values and insights. The crisis in the Gulf has created a new form of internationalism. Unlike in the past, when the so-called internationalism of the Soviet Union, for example, was dictated by narrow group and class interests, there is today an internationalism which is based on the unreserved support of all countries for the UN Charter," Petrovskiy said, suggesting that so far we can draw two conclusions from what has happened:

1. Political methods are the most effective when it comes to controlling and resolving conflicts;

2. The countries of the world are indissolubly tied to each other, and for this reason all solutions require consensus.

"Global and regional security structures have a reciprocal effect on each other. Today there are no unilateral relations between countries. No country can set itself up against the shared march of civilization. The world is interconnected, and that is why the unstable situation in the Soviet Union is giving rise to concern in Europe and the rest of the world. The same is true of the Middle East, which is the only 'blank spot' on the security map of the world. As soon as the current crisis is over, an international conference on the problems in the Middle East should be started—the Palestinian problem, the crisis in Lebanon, and controls over arms supplies in the region are some of the problems that must be tackled," Petrovskiy said, rejecting in advance any ready-made solutions.

"The time is past when ready-to-cook recipes could be written in the White House and the Kremlin. I hope that the foreign policy process in Europe (the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe) can act as an inspiration for the establishment of security institutions elsewhere in the world."

World Trade Unions Federation Council Meets

LD1211222690 Moscow TASS in English 2213 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondents Igor Agabekov and Vladimir Yegorov]

[Text] Moscow November 13 TASS—The strengthening of the world trade union movement's unity was urged by participants of the 43rd session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), which was held in Moscow on Monday [12 November].

Convened on the eve of the opening in the Soviet capital of the 12th World Trade Union Congress, the session discussed questions relating to the holding of this forum, in which representatives of 130 countries will take part.

Participants exchanged views on the draft document "On the Renewal of the World Federation of Trade Unions" and proposed amendments to the federation rules, which will be considered by the forthcoming forum. The session also discussed the organisation's financial problems.

Commenting on the results of the session, WFTU Secretary Alain Stern told a news conference here today that the discussion had focused on restructuring WFTU activities in light of radical changes in the world as a whole and in Eastern Europe in particular.

Stern said General Council members differed on prospects for the Federation. However, he stressed, they all agreed that it should be preserved.

In order to defend working people's social and economic rights, speakers noted, unity was required in the trade union ranks.

All participants agreed that the Federation needed decentralisation, and its bureaucracy should be cut. It should work in different regions, and released funds should be used to finance specific measures from which working people can benefit.

Asked whether the Federation should be depoliticised, Stern said that the Federation favoured discarding party and ideological fetters and stepping up activity to meet working people's social demands.

He noted that trade unions' actions against apartheid in South Africa or their demand that governments should promulgate laws on trade unions were also politics which the WFTU did not intend to give up.

The WFTU secretary said that the renewed federation would no longer taboo discussions of various problems relating to socialist countries. It will favour impartial consideration of working people's situation in any part of the globe.

The WFTU seeks a final end to the Cold War and insists that the money saved by disarmament be used for the benefit of the working people, Stern said.

Conference on European Change Opens in Lisbon

LD0911100590 Moscow TASS in English 0939 GMT 9 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Reshitilov]

[Text] Lisbon November 9 TASS—A three-day theoretical conference on the subject "Stability in Europe in the Period of Changes" opened here today. International relations experts from 12 European, American and African countries have focused their attention on the building of a new Europe in the light of radical changes in Central and East European countries, the role of NATO, the European Community and other supranational political and economic organizations, the equilibrium in Europe and its dependence on North-South relations.

When opening the forum, which was organised by the Portuguese Institute for International Strategic Studies, Jorge Sampayo, the mayor of Lisbon, emphasised the importance of economic, financial and political support for the processes taking place in the Soviet Union, the processes on the success of which the future stability on the European continent depends to a large extent.

Portuguese Foreign Minister Joao de Deus Pinheiro, in an opening speech, mentioned the need to strengthen integration processes in Europe with due regard for changes taking place on the continent.

The European Community should make an effective contribution to the successful realisation of reforms in the Soviet Union and grant short-term credits to the tune of $20 billion, he said. Pinheiro also voiced concern over the widening gap between North-South economic development levels.

United States & Canada

Joint U.S. Military Conversion Roundtable Held

LD1311091590 Moscow TASS in English 0900 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS analyst Boris Grishchenko]

[Text] Moscow November 13 TASS—The key-note of a debate, which began between Soviet and American specialists in economics and diplomacy in Moscow on Monday, is that the conversion of the munitions industry should be a field of permanent and extensive cooperation between the two countries.

This roundtable sponsored by several institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences, on the Soviet side, and the Economic Priorities Council, on the American side, is attended by leading scholars, politicians and engineers from both countries.

They include academician Stanislav Shatalin, the author of the most radical draft of the USSR's transition to market relations, which was named "the 500-day" programme.

Addressing the meeting, Shatalin said: "A real market in the Soviet Union will be created when the defence complex, the most technically perfect and, therefore, capable of fruitful cooperation with western technologies, gives a helping hand in forming market relations".

"As for the establishment of a market economy, it is a question of social survival for the Soviet people," Shatalin added.

Roundtable participants were interested in a speech by Ohio Governor Richard Celeste, who dwelt at length on a possibility to compensate for jobs lost as a result of dwindling military production. He noted that other jobs can be created by accelerated development of other economic sectors in his state.

"This problem is squarely facing many regions in the Soviet Union," said Oleg Baklanov, chairman of the Soviet Communist Party Commission on Military Policy. This year alone, the Soviet munitions industry will release nearly 500,000 engineers and skilled workers, he noted.

"It is a difficult problem for the Soviet strained economy to retrain them quickly and to compensate for their wage losses," he continued. "Several elements of the American approach to tackling such problems may be useful for the USSR."

Discussion participants repeatedly stressed that the possibility of using the partner's experience is based on the similarity of both conversion doctrines. Both Americans and Russians believe that haste and rush decisions are inadmissible in such expensive and large-scale work.

Such decisions may lead to losses in science and technology, while miscalculations in the social sphere may generate sentiments against conversion among many people.

That is why the two sides intend to conduct conversion openly. A wish was expressed to hand-pick several "pairs" of related enterprises in the USSR and the United States to create a common model for the conversion of the munitions industries.

The roundtable in Moscow will last a week. American guests will visit several enterprises which were top secret projects of the Soviet defence complex until recently.

U.S., Philippines To Scrap 1947 Bases Agreement

LD0911115890 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 9 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Bokhonko]

[Text] Manila November 9 TASS—The Philippines and the United States have agreed to scrap the 1947 agreement on the bases, which expires in September next year. Instead, a new agreement on the future of Washington's key military bases, more fully taking into account the current relations between the two countries, will be concluded.

An accord to this effect was reached here during the third round of talks designed to determine the future of the Pentagon's six facilities on the archipelago.

However, this decision by no means signifies that the United States renounces its bases in the Philippines altogether.

As is clear from remarks before journalists by a U.S. spokesman, Washington intends to keep access to the Clark Field Air Force base and the Subic Bay naval base.

"We suggest a long transition period, 10 to 12 years, that would give the United States a continued access to the facilities," the spokesman said.

The United States will gradually withdraw its troops. At the conclusion of the transition period, the U.S. would like to have access to a number of military facilities and keep small presence of personnel in the Philippines by analogy to similar agreements it has with Spain, Greece, Portugal and Turkey.

A Philippine spokesman, for his part, explained that, apart from the Subic Bay, a further use by the Pentagon of the bombing range at Crow Valley and the military cargo supply airfield at the Clark Field base was also discussed.

He welcomed the decision announced by the United States on Thursday to withdraw all U.S. fighter aircraft, at a strength of two squadrons of Pantom aircraft, from the Clark Field next year, regarding it as a token of cooperation on the part of the U.S.

Philippine Foreign Minister Raul Manglapus described the decision to withdraw U.S. troops as the Philippines' partial win at the talks.

Soviet Delegation Observes U.S. Voting Methods

LD1111161790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0808 GMT 11 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Kuznetsov]

[Summary] New York, 11 November (TASS)—Interviewed by a TASS correspondent on Saturday, V.P. Orlov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission for the election of USSR people's deputies who is currently heading a Soviet delegation visiting the United States at the invitation of the Federal Election Commission, said that the U.S. electoral system has much of value to offer the Soviet Union. During their 10-day visit, the delegation members observed the mid-term Congress and local elections held on 6 November. The greatest impression for Orlov was left by the work done with the voters, which stressed the need for them to realize the importance of the elections and to take part in them. He was also impressed by the work of the polling stations and the procedure for counting votes.

"In conditions of further developing democracy and the multiparty system in the USSR, work at the polling stations, the place at which voting actually happens, should be altered to a certain extent," said Orlov. "This refers to the procedure for handing out voting slips and the procedure for counting them. In connection with the fact that we now have not one but several candidates standing for election at the same time, the count must be particularly careful."

While admiring the fact that electoral commissions in the United States operate constantly and that there is a permanent staff engaged in drawing up lists of voters and working with them, Orlov noted that the cumbersome system "bound up with the existence of a whole series of restrictions and electoral qualifications" for registering electors in the United States suffers by comparison with that in the Soviet Union, "where all citizens who have reached the age of 18 are automatically placed on the list of voters." "Very close and useful relations, which fully correspond to the current spirit of cooperation in Soviet-U.S. relations, have been established between the Central Electoral Commission for the election of USSR people's deputies and the Federal Election Commission in recent years," noted V.P. Orlov. "We plan to further develop these contacts."

China

Picketers Protest Outside PRC Embassy in Moscow

OW1311140390 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1000 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Text] A group of about 10 youths picketed outside the Chinese Embassy in Moscow on Monday [12 November]. Calling themselves representatives of the Soviet chapter of Amnesty International, they said that their action was aimed at attracting the attention of international mass media on the fate of Wang Xize, who is in prison in China.

According to them, Wang, editor of an unofficial journal, was sentenced to prison in May 1982 because of counterrevolutionary crime. The picketing lasted for about 40 minutes. There was no clash with police.

Chinese Editor's Moscow Visit Detailed

OW1311102690 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1300 GMT 12 Nov 90

[From the "Half An Hour With Wang Xiao" program]

[Text] Dear listeners: A RENMIN RIBAO delegation led by Comrade Zhao Huaze, editor in chief of the paper, recently visited our country. Radio Moscow previously reported on the visit. Today we are going to give a more detailed account of the results of this visit. My personal feeling is that this visit by CPC Central Committee personnel is another sign of the development of cooperation between the Soviet and Chinese Communist Parties.

What agreement was reached during the talks between Comrade Zhao Huaze and PRAVDA Chief Editor Frolov? In an interview with our reporter (Gilisov), Comrade Zhao Huaze said:

[Begin Zhao recording] Increasing the contacts and cooperation between RENMIN RIBAO and PRAVDA is a wish shared by the leaders of the two papers. When Comrade Frolov met with our delegation, he said that cooperation between the two papers was just at the inceptive stage. The current visit by the RENMIN RIBAO delegation has increased our mutual understanding. Both sides agreed that RENMIN RIBAO and PRAVDA will further develop cooperation in the future. I think that PRAVDA and RENMIN RIBAO will exchange delegations and dispatch reporters to cover news events in each other's country. In this way people of each country will be made aware of the situation of the other side, thus enhancing the friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples. With respect to cooperation in the [words indistinct] field, it is only a wish, or an ideal, that we have. At this time, we have no concrete idea or method for this cooperation to speak of. Therefore, this situation should be examined by comrades of the departments concerned. [end recording]

When the RENMIN RIBAO delegation was visiting our country, PRAVDA published an article by Comrade Zhao Huaze. On the eve of celebrating the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Comrade Zhao Huaze stated his views on this revolution and on socialism. While touring the various parts of our country, the Chinese guests came to understand that through the process of reforming various aspects of the people's lives in our country, we have returned to the ideals announced in October 1917.

Comrade Zhao Huaze told our reporter:

[Begin Zhao recording] During this visit to the Soviet Union, comrades of our RENMIN RIBAO delegation were grateful for the meticulous arrangements made by PRAVDA and for the warm and friendly hospitality accorded them by comrades of the units and departments concerned in various localities. We visited collective farms, factories, colleges, and research institutes, all of which were very friendly to the Chinese people and showed great interest in China's economic construction and reform. This indicates that the friendship between the Chinese and Soviet people has a solid foundation.

The October Revolution has touched our hearts very much. If we look back on revolutionary history, we will see that the October Revolution led by Lenin was a great event. The Chinese revolution triumphed under the influence of the October Revolution. We are very pleased to have had this opportunity to participate in the celebrations of the October Revolution, and we wish to extend warm congratulations to the Soviet Communist Party and its members and also to all the Soviet people.

China and the Soviet Union are two friendly neighbors. In the past, we originally had lots of contacts, but later the contacts were suspended. Now, however, relations have been resumed through the efforts of the leaders of our two parties and two countries. During the past year or so, our relations have shown development. We firmly believe that the friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples is everlasting, and we are confident that the Chinese and Soviet peoples will surely pass on this friendship from generation to generation. [end recording]

These remarks were made at our station's microphone by Comrade Zhao Huaze, editor in chief of RENMIN RIBAO, who recently visited our country.

Official Gives Impressions of Visit to PRC

OW1311195390 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 2200 GMT 12 Nov 90

[From the "Hello, China" program]

[Text] Dear listeners, please listen to an interview by station reporter (Gadintov) with (Maslin), a member of the International Affairs Commission under the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

(Maslin) said: The deepest impression of my visit to China is that the broad masses of people in various strata all warmly support the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. On many occasions, I realized that the tradition of mutual respect between the Soviet and the Chinese people, as well as their feelings of neighborliness and friendship, are very deeply rooted.

While touching on the experiences in the economic reform carried out by China, (Maslin) pointed out:

[Begin (Maslin) recording in Russian fading into Mandarin translation] I am of the opinion that in implementing economic reform, Chinese leaders and the high-level executive organs have displayed a greater degree of uniformity when compared to us. For instance, all questions concerning economic reform in China are sanctioned by corresponding laws. I also have seen that the solution of some problems calls for long deliberation and may be subject to risk. This is inevitable. The leaders of China gradually are solving these problems. Consider, for example, the establishment of special economic zones. In our country, many cities and localities have declared the establishment of free economic zones in their own areas. However, this seems somewhat hasty. Some comrades in China explained to me that their special economic zones are set up gradually after examining and clearly formulating the relevant laws and regulations and passing new laws governing the readjustment of all economic relations in the special economic zones. Only then do they turn on the green light for the expansion of this new and promising form of operation.

The important thing is that the state occupies a decisive position. Of course, some social problems have emerged in the implementation of special economic zones. However, people all know those problems, and measures are being taken to solve these problems. This also involves the whole country. For example, I have come to understand how Chinese society shows concern for retirees. I am very satisfied with it. I feel that there are many aspects in China that merit detailed study. We also can learn from their experiences.

I intend to introduce, in detail, China's experiences in converting military industry to civilian uses to Soviet deputies. I believe that the experiences accumulated by China in converting military industry to civilian uses are of great importance. We visited a machinery manufacturing plant in Shanghai with aeronautical technology and talked to local leaders. In the production of daily necessities, including advanced refrigerators, they have effectively made use of technology and technical cadres of high standard. However, in our country, some enterprises under joint national defense industries are forced to begin with the production of some minor items that do not reqire very high technology and technical standards.

I would like to mention one more point, namely, China has implemented a proper policy on cadres. This policy has enabled the staff members and workers in military industry to master the new technology for the production of goods for civilian uses within a short period. This has not brought about any loss to the material life of staff members and workers. [end recording]

University Awards Doctorate to PRC Scientist

OW1311142690 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 2200 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Report by station reporter (Yezhelekov); from "Hello, China" program—passages within quotation marks are recorded]

[Text] Dear listeners, on 12 November, at Bauman Moscow State Technology University, Song Jian, a celebrated Chinese natural scientist, replied to queries on his doctoral dissertation, and was awarded a doctorate of science and technology. Our station reporter (Yezhelekov) said:

[(Yezhelekov)] Today's academic council meeting of Bauman Moscow State Technology University is different from the past. Attending the meeting are a large number of reporters from radio and television stations and the press, apart from world-renowned scientists. The reason for holding this academic meeting is unusual. Song Jian, a graduate of this university in 1958, a graduate student who defended his thesis for a candidate doctorate in 1961, a winner of the Einstein International Prize, China's state councellor and minister in charge of the State Science and Technology Commission, replied to queries on his doctor's dissertation here. It must be pointed out that scientists are faithful to their academic requirements. They have carefully perused Song Jian's academic thesis and report, asked questions, heard the reactions of scientific research organs to the thesis, pointed out the merits of Song Jian's academic report, and put forward suggestions and views. Finally, they unanimously approved Song Jian's dissertation entitled "Application of Advanced Optimal Control Theory to Technology and Social Science" and conferred on Comrade Song Jian a doctorate of technological science in accordance with the decision of the highest assessment committee of the Academic Council of Bauman Moscow State Technology University. The results of the voting of members of the Academic Council showed that all 24 members were in favor of the decision. On the same day, in a very solemn atmosphere, they presented Comrade Song Jian with the certificate of Doctor of Science and Technology. On this day of great significance to him, our station reporter asked him to say a few words to Chinese listeners of Moscow Radio.

[Song Jian] "I am very happy that, after leaving the university 30 years ago, I can visit my Alma Mater on the way today and see my teachers, as well as my fellow students. I feel greatly honored that they have come to hear my speech and report. I think we are all happy. Our fellow graduates, in whatever positions they may be, must make their best possible contributions to their people and the advancement of science in the world. I have not done well, but I have made my own efforts."

[(Yezhelekov)] The professors here have said you have done very well.

[Song Jian] "I want to thank them for their praise."

[(Yezhelekov)] What else would you like to say?

[Song Jian] "I would like to say a few words to the Chinese listeners. China resumed normal diplomatic and political relations with our great neighbor, the Soviet Union, last year. I hold that this is very important to our two countries. We should continue to strengthen cooperation. As a scientist, I hope, in particular, to strengthen cooperation in the fields of science and technology. Soviet scientists are excellent and are first rate in basic research and in all the high technological aspects, comparable to any capitalist country, and in many cases have surpassed other developed, capitalist countries. Furthermore, I think the scientific and technological circles throughout China highly esteem and respect them. Of course, China has developed in recent years. Our science and technology have also made relatively rapid progress. I think we can be highly complementary to each other, which is of great mutual benefit to the Chinese and Soviet peoples. I hope we can advance together in a complementary manner."

[(Yezhelekov)] Thank you. I would like to congratulate you once again.

[Song Jian] "Thank you."

Northeast Asia

Consultations With DPRK Held in Pyongyang

LD1211155690 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Nadashkevich]

[Text] Pyongyang November 12 TASS—Soviet North-Korean political consultations were held here on November 10 and today. They were conducted by Genrikh Kireyev, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Directorate for Asian Socialist Countries and Pak Hyong-Bo, head of a North-Korean Foreign Ministry department.

The sides exchanged views on Soviet-Korean relations and the situation in the Asian-Pacific region. Various aspects of the situation on the Korean peninsula were discussed in detail.

The Soviet side voiced support for the dialogue between the heads of government of North and South Korea, which opened real perspectives for inter-Korean settlement.

Participants in the consultations expressed confidence that friendly relations between the Soviet Union and North Korea would continue to progress.

USSR, South Korea Establish Direct Sea Links

PM1311095590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Union Edition p 4

[Report by TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev: "Announcement in Seoul"]

[Text] Tokyo, 10 Nov—Next month direct sea links will be established between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Korea. The accord on this question, as announced in Seoul today, was reached during talks between representatives of the Far Eastern Maritime Steamship Company and two South Korean companies specializing in maritime shipping.

According to a RENKHAP [name as transliterated] news agency report, the agreement envisages that each day two container ships—one each way—will make the 816-km sea journey between the Soviet port of Vostochnyy and Pusan, South Korea's largest port.

The opening of direct sea communications between the USSR and the Republic of Korea, specialists believe, will promote the further activation of mutually beneficial bilateral trade and economic cooperation which was given a boost by the recent establishment of diplomatic relations between the countries. The commodity exchange volume between the two countries rose 71.4 percent between January and June this year compared with the same period last year to reach $415.6 million. It is expected that the figure for 1990 as a whole could exceed $1 billion.

Japan 'Hampering' Economic Aid to USSR

PM0911115090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[TASS, REUTER, and UPI roundup: "Japan Bides Its Time"]

[Text] Japan's NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN reports that the Japanese Government has decided not to recognize Japanese bank investments in Soviet financial institutions in the near future. Settling on this course, it has, in particular, put off considering a request from one local bank—Michinoku—for approval for its planned investment in a new bank in the USSR. In the newspaper's opinion, this decision squares with the Japanese Government's general course of hampering economic aid to the Soviets, including restrictions of the establishment of local bank branches, until the USSR agrees to make concessions on the question of the return of the "Northern Territories."

Lukyanov Talks With Japanese Officials, Quayle

LD1311144590 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev]

[Text] Tokyo November 13 TASS—Soviet parliament chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov and Japanese house of councillors Speaker Yoshihito Tsuchiya, who met here today, discussed the prospects for the development of political dialogue between the USSR and Japan.

Special emphasis was put on contacts between Soviet and Japanese legislators. The Japanese side expressed an idea that Japan and the Soviet Union, as Asian states, should jointly act in the interests of peace in the Asia-Pacific region and the entire world.

The sides discussed a forthcoming visit to the USSR by a Japanese parliamentary delegation to be led by Tsuchiya.

Japanese lawmakers noted that they regard this trip as an important stage in preparations for President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan next April.

Later in the day, Lukyanov had a detailed conversation with chairman of the Japanese Socialist Party Central Executive Committee Takako Doi. The sides focused on security and cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Soviet side supported an initiative by the Japanese Socialist Party to establish a zone of peace and cooperation in the Sea of Japan area.

Doi described her party's position concerning support for the USSR's perestroika in the economic sphere, noting the need for Japan to be more active in this sphere.

The two sides expressed concern over the Gulf situation and favored a peaceful settlement of the crisis.

The meeting was attended by Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev and Soviet ambassador Lyudvig Chizhov.

During a meeting between Lukyanov and U.S. Vice-President Dan Quayle, the two sides discussed the role of contacts between the Soviet and American legislatures in developing bilateral relations in various spheres and improving understanding between the Soviet and American peoples.

Quayle, chairman of the U.S. National Space Council, pointed to the interest of the American side in cooperation with the USSR in peaceful space exploration.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Cambodian Settlement Talks Continue

9 Nov Pyongyang Talks Noted

OW1111133390 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Commentary by Nikolayev from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Listeners, Genrikh Kireyev, head of a Soviet Foreign Ministry department, met with Prince Sihanouk in Pyongyang on 9 November. Station commentator Nikolayev points out:

Among the major steps taken recently to speed up the settlement of the Cambodian conflict, the event taking place in Pyongyang may be recorded as one of crucial importance. The Soviet diplomat's meeting with Sihanouk was proof of the Soviet Union's new political thinking. This can be said because not so very long ago such a meeting could only have been seen in a negative light. There is little doubt that the establishment of direct Soviet contact with one of Cambodia's most prestigious political activists has opened another channel for the settlement of the Cambodian issue. However, the meeting should not be viewed as if Moscow has decided to stand on the side of Cambodia's opposition faction represented by Sihanouk, thus damaging the interests of the Cambodian Government. In his meeting with Sihanouk, the Soviet Foreign Ministry official explained the Soviet position very explicitly. He stated that at present,

when the settlement of the Cambodian issue is at a critical stage, Sihanouk could play a due role in creating the conditions necessary for ending bloodshed and for holding a general election under UN supervision. He expressed the hope that Prince Sihanouk, once he is elected chairman of Cambodia's National Supreme Council [NSC], would take a neutral stand to maintain balance among the various factions and place the interest of national reconciliation above the internal conflicting interests. Sihanouk also advocated national reconciliation.

The question of the distribution of seats in the NSC may be resolved in the near future. I do not rule out this possibility. An AFP report from Bangkok, for instance, also has confirmed this. The report was based on the results of Thai Foreign Minister Subin Pinkhayan's recent visit to Beijing. The AFP correspondent reported: Foreign diplomats in Bangkok pointed out that in his meeting with Subin Pinkhayan, the Chinese foreign minister did not express opposition to Phnom Penh government leader Hun Sen serving as vice chairman of the NSC, provided that Sihanouk is made its chairman. In short, a compromise is a very realistic development. The question is whether the various Cambodian factions themselves want to compromise. If the answer is yes, then the mechanism for resolving the Cambodian conflict based on the fundamental principle drawn up by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and generally accepted by the various Cambodian parties will begin to take effect.

Rogachev Attends Jakarta Talks

LD1111145790 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 11 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Petrov]

[Text] Jakarta November 11 TASS—Impressive results were achieved at a working consultative meeting on Cambodia in Jakarta on November 9-10, Soviet delegation, told TASS and Soviet television here today.

The meeting was called by the Indonesian and French foreign ministers, co-chairmen of the Paris international conference on Cambodia.

The meeting was held during preparations for the resumption of the Paris international forum before the end of this year and the drafting of an agreement on a comprehensive political settlement of the Cambodian conflict.

It was also attended by delegations from the USSR, the United States, China and Britain, permanent U.N. Security Council members, as well as Australia, Japan, India, Canada, Malaysia and Laos, co-chairmen countries of working committees of the Paris conference, and U.N. secretary-general representative Rafeeuddin Ahmed.

Rogachev noted that the Jakarta meeting began in a difficult situation in Cambodia due to stepped-up military operations by Khmer Rouge units against government troops.

Therefore, various opinions clashed at the meeting, and the discussion was sometimes heated.

Nevertheless, all participants had one common goal—to draft outlines for an agreement on a comprehensive political settlement in Cambodia, which will be submitted to the final meeting of the Paris conference, Rogachev noted.

After two days of intensive discussions, meeting participants could hammer out the outlines of a future document from among several drafts.

In addition to the main agreement, it will include several supplements, including ones on administration in Cambodia during the transition period, military measures, preparations for general elections and restoration of the country after agreements are signed.

Rogachev noted that it is soon planned to hold a meeting in Paris between conference co-chairman and all members of the Cambodian Supreme National Council. Cambodians will determine their attitude to the document, which is not mandatory, he added.

They are masters of their country, and they have the final say. If Cambodians approve the draft, a meeting of the coordination committee of the Paris peace conference, consisting of all its members, will be called.

A meeting between a Soviet representative and Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the first in 20 years, was held in Pyongyang on the eve of the Jakarta forum. A report on this event made by the Soviet delegation in Jakarta evoked general interest and was approved by meeting participants, Rogachev noted.

This meeting will promote a Cambodian settlement and will help find points of contact between the Cambodian sides, he stressed.

Dealing with Soviet-Indonesian relations, Rogachev emphasised that they are gradually becoming more dynamic.

The two countries are successfully developing the political dialogue that was drowned with the Gorbachev-Suharto talks in Moscow in September 1989. Trade and economic relations are improving.

Nevertheless, much can still be done to raise the volume of bilateral trade to a level conforming to the huge potentialities of the two countries, Rogachev said.

Moscow recently registered the first Soviet-Indonesian venture to process palm oil.

The two sides reached an understanding to set up a joint venture to process tea leaves. Talks are in progress on cooperation to develop peat bogs on Sumatra, joint production of clothing, and cooperation in footwear and in other fields.

During recent Soviet-Indonesian political consultations in Jakarta, Rogachev noted, the two sides discussed

prospects for the development of bilateral relations in various fields as well as some other issues, including more active Soviet participation in regional economic organisations.

Rogachev pointed to Indonesia's positive attitude to a more active Soviet involvement in the international division of labour in the Asian-Pacific region.

Burma Seeks To Rejoin Nonaligned Movement

BK1411075190 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT 14 Nov 90

[Commentary by station observer Yuriy Kostin]

[Text] Dear listeners, it has been reported that the present leadership in Myanmar [Burma] has submitted an application to the Nonaligned Movement Headquarters asking that the country be readmitted into the Nonaligned Movement. Our observer Yuriy Kostin made the following comments in this connection:

As far as I can remember, many remarks were made about Myanmar's decision to leave the Nonaligned Movement in 1979. The fact is Myanmar was one of the founders of the Nonaligned Movement. It would perhaps suffice just to say that Myanmar played an important role in the convening of the Bandung conference which established the fundamental principles of the Nonaligned Movement. We also heard the loud and clear voice of Myanmar at the conference held in Belgrade to officially launch the movement in 1961.

The question then is why did the Myanmar leadership decide to leave that movement later on? The explanation given for the departure was that the Nonaligned Movement had deviated from its original objectives and that the progressive members in the movement were to blame for it. But judging from the events that took place later, either from the viewpoint of the Myanmar national interests or from the viewpoint of the improving general conditions in the world, the reason given by Myanmar for the departure was not good enough.

Making an objective analysis of what the world has experienced in recent years, the decision made by the Yangon [Rangoon] government to rejoin the Nonaligned Movement comes as no surprise. The situation now is so much better compared to 1979 when all the world regions were having more than their share of conflicts. One still remembers the concern shared by several nonaligned nations then. They believed that the establishment of military blocs to confront one another and the uncontrollable arms race perpetrated by the blocs complicated the world situation and affected the nonaligned nations. Today such fears have disappeared not only in Myanmar but also among the majority of the 102 Nonaligned Movement members.

The decisions made by these nations at the last Nonaligned Movement conference in Belgrade in September of last year also confirmed this. The decisions not only reflected the great changes in the world but also how the movement viewed those changes. The Nonaligned Movement, which used to criticize the military bloc mentality of the superpowers, has now moved toward dialogue and cooperation with the big nations. For the most part the change in attitude is the result of improving Soviet-U.S. relations and the move toward no longer perceiving the USSR and the United States as two military powers confronting one another.

While these two nations have signed an agreement on the dismantlement of short- and medium-range nuclear missiles, they have also been making preparations to conclude an agreement on the dismantlement of half of their strategic weapons. It is evident that the trend will help facilitate the situation of the nonaligned nations. Previously, some countries—for instance, the Philippines—used to see U.S. military bases as providing them with security. But these nations have started to look to the Nonaligned Movement and are demanding the withdrawal of the Pentagon's military bases on their soil.

The Nonaligned Movement has become the guardian of peace and security for these nations. At the same time, the Nonaligned Movement has been playing a more prominent role in the building of a new world order and in the restructing of international economic relations. Some people are continuing their work based on the principle that our world is divided into southern and northern hemispheres. It is true that they try to explain all contradictions in the global economic system on the basis of that theory. Whatever the reasoning may be, the most important point, as declared in Belgrade, is to settle the problems that exist between the developing nations and the multinationals of Western nations.

This conclusion also holds true for Myanmar, which has a foreign debt of more than $500 billion. There are signs of interest within the Nonaligned Movement to set up new economic organizations. On the basis of a new political outlook, nonaligned nations in Belgrade raised important issues, such as the right to be economically independent, the issue of human rights, and the right to a secure and clean natural environment.

Nonaligned nations also contributed to stopping and settling conflicts in Namibia, Cambodia, and Afghanistan and in the improvement of Sino-Indian relations. The reentry of Myanmar into the Nonaligned Movement would, perhaps, help resolve the problems that the country has been facing in the development of foreign economic relations and of national economic development.

It is apparent that its departure from the Nonaligned Movement has exacerbated Myanmar's problems. It is never easy to cross a broken bridge. But, if the crossing is still possible, it may be easy to repair that bridge. According to the initiative taken by the Nonaligned Movement, the United Nations has declared the 1990's the Decade of International Law. This is an important decision. It is also significant for Myanmar.

As observers point out, the matter of Myanmar fully rejoining the international movement will greatly depend on the way the process of democratization, which has already been initiated with the holding of elections, is implemented. It is believed that when Myanmar reenters the Nonaligned Movement, conditions will be created for the improvement of its relations with quite a number of nations.

Near East & South Asia

Belonogov, Petrovskiy Conduct Mideast, Gulf Tour

PM1311170590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by M. Yusin: "Two Representatives of the USSR President Have Flown to the Near East"]

[Text] As a USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman told your IZVESTIYA correspondent, Deputy Foreign Ministers A.M. Belonogov and V.F. Petrovskiy, representatives of the Soviet leadership and the USSR president, flew to the Near East 13 November.

The aim of the mission is to "obtain the fullest possible picture of the present stage of the search for ways to settle the crisis in the Persian Gulf and to find out Arab friends' assessments and their view of the situation and approaches to the holding of a pan-Arab summit."

"We support the idea of such a conference," the Foreign Ministry spokesman stated, "as being aimed at activating the Arab factor—for the purpose, of course, of securing unconditional implementation of the well-known UN Security Council resolutions."

A.M. Belonogov will visit Yemen, Egypt (where he will also meet with the Arab League leadership), Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates.

V.F. Petrovskiy is going to Morocco, Tunisia (where in addition to other contacts he will meet with the PLO leadership), Libya, and Algeria.

As the Foreign Ministry spokesman reported, a visit to Iraq is not planned. The A.M. Belonogov and V.F. Petrovskiy mission will last around a week.

Primakov Interviewed on Mideast Crisis Resolution

91UF0135A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 45, 7 Nov 90 pp 1, 10

[Interview with Yevgeniy Primakov, member of the USSR Presidential Council, by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA political correspondent Igor Belyayev; place and date not given: "The Near East: Still Chances for Peace"]

[Text] War—to be or not to be? Yes, a real war in the Persian Gulf region. This almost Shakespearian question has arisen today as a result of the menacing development of events following Iraq's seizure of neighboring Kuwait. The fate of the new international order taking shape in the modern world is at stake.

[Belyayev] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, you have just returned from a tour of the Near East and prior to this had made a two additional round trips—first to the Near East, then to West Europe and the United States. May it be considered that all of this is united by the "Primakov mission" concept, and what is the purpose of it?

[Primakov] First of all, I would like to say that it is wrong to call the trips that were made, which do, indeed, represent a single whole, the "Primakov mission." The meetings, contacts, discussions, and exchange of opinions with the leaders of various countries—of Iraq twice, Jordan, Italy, France, Britain, the United States, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Kuwait, and the PLO—all this was done on the instructions of President M.S. Gorbachev. I was guided during these contacts primarily by the instructions received directly from the president of the USSR.

And now about the purpose of the actions.

Iraq suddenly occupied Kuwait and subsequently annexed it. These actions brought about practically universal condemnation. The UN Security Council had passed a number of resolutions demanding the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait. The resolutions provide for economic sanctions against Iraq also. They are being implemented. The Soviet Union's position is in no way different in this respect from that of the whole world community.

We are for Iraq quitting Kuwait and the restoration there of the situation as it existed prior to 2 August. We are for Iraq, which has swallowed up another state—a member of the United Nations—not to be "rewarded" here.

[Belyayev] I believe that this approach of ours should be interpreted broadly. It is, after all, not only a question of Iraq's annexation of Kuwait. A dangerous precedent at odds with the efforts aimed at the creation of a world without wars and aggression has been created.

[Primakov] Of course, the position taken by the Soviet Union is of great significance, not only in respect to the specific events that have occurred in the Persian Gulf zone. The world is obviously emerging from the state of "cold war." New "rules of behavior" and a new world order based on the impossibility of the use of force against other states in one's own egotistical interests are needed. We have the sorry experience of the 1930's. Under the new conditions, it is necessary to do everything to guard against its repetition. The end of the "cold war" and the emergence from the rigid East-West confrontation must not be replaced by a new stage of "permissiveness" for those—"Third World" states on this occasion—who possess relatively greater military possibilities compared with their neighbors. Naturally, this applies not only to the "Third World" but also to the world community as a whole.

[Balyayev] Consequently, the mission undertaken on the instructions of the USSR president was aimed at eliminating the results of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and compelling it to withdraw its forces?

[Primakov] Undoubtedly. But it would be wrong to confine it just to these assignments set by the president.

As you know, at the request of Saudi Arabia, the United States, and a number of other states transferred their forces to its territory and the territory of the United Arab Emirates. Naval forces have been committed to the waters of the Persian Gulf. This armed assault force—the principal constituent of which is the United States—is, at the present time, performing a military demonstration function. In other words, it is making Iraq understand that if it refuses to withdraw its forces, it will face the prospect of a military solution of the crisis. In the opinion of the Soviet leadership, however, we need to do everything possible to ensure the withdrawal of the Iraqi forces by political methods. Of what might they consist?

In a speech on 12 August, Iraqi President Saddam Husayn proposed a kind of "linkage" of the withdrawal of his forces with the simultaneous solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict and the situation in Lebanon. In this same speech S. Husayn maintained that Kuwait was a part of Iraq and that under such conditions consent to the withdrawal of Iraqi forces was being given as a goodwill gesture. It is perfectly obvious that such a "package" is unacceptable. It was viewed as an attempt to be "rewarded" for a crime.

However, such warranted negativism should not, we believe, slam the door on the search for a political settlement altogether. The "scenario" could be approximately as follows: Iraq unconditionally withdraws its forces from Kuwait, but this should be followed by certain decisions designed to contribute to a stabilization of the situation in the region and satisfaction of the interests of many states. It was, in fact, such a policy that was proposed by President M.S. Gorbachev during the "summit" meeting in Helsinki: A settlement of the Kuwait crisis should lend impetus to all the other recuperative processes in the region, primarily a solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict, the core of which is the Palestinian problem. This idea was recorded also in the joint Soviet-American statement that crowned the top-level meeting in Helsinki.

[Belyayev] Which prompts the question: Do you believe that there is a possibility of the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait with regard for all these circumstances?

[Primakov] This is the most important question, perhaps. As I have already mentioned, I have met Saddam Husayn twice within a month—on 5 and 28 October. You will agree, of course, that the shades of meaning brought out in conversation and the emphases put on this proposition or the other or an obvious desire to avoid this problem or the other are important for an understanding of his position. Upon a close comparative analysis of these two conversations, it may be concluded, it would seem to me, that the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait on the basis of a political settlement is not out of the question. And this is a very serious affirmation. After all, a military solution could entail a whole chain of processes with such negative consequences that it is difficult to evaluate its full scale even today. Not to mention the casualties and devastation. The following cynical expression is popular among politicians in the West: "unacceptable losses." All losses are essentially unacceptable. But even if the Western term is employed, the parties' losses in the event of a military solution would be in excess of the level it denotes. Nor should it be forgotten that very rich oil sites are situated in the possible military theater itself and close by. Many people believe that, in the event of war, they will be blown up, which threatens not only a halt to oil production but also an ecological tragedy. It may be concluded also that a military outcome would lead to the destabilization of many regimes in this region, which would make the situation even more fragile.

[Belyayev] But there is something else that is no less important: How might a political settlement be viewed by those in the Arab world who are supporting a halt to the Iraqi aggression and the elimination of its consequences?

[Primakov] From the numerous discussions I have had in Arab countries, I have the impression that the vast majority understands the dangers that lurk in the military "option." But this understanding does not contradict the certainty that Iraq must leave Kuwait. There is, consequently, a move toward political solutions from this side also.

Practically no leader of an Arab country rejects the idea of negotiations between Iraq and Kuwait on the disputed territorial and economic issues. But only **after the withdrawal of forces.**

I have gleaned from these discussions one further conviction—following the withdrawal of Iraq's forces, the Arab states, in conjunction with the United States and the other countries that have Armed Forces in the Persian Gulf zone, also will decide the question of a termination of the foreign military presence in its present form in Saudi Arabia. Why do I say "in its present form?" Because if Saudi Arabia asks that these forces be replaced by inter-Arab forces—with or without the participation of other Muslim states—such an option is, as many of those with whom I spoke observed, likely. Nor, in fact, is this contrary to the policy officially declared by the United States. During a news conference in Helsinki, President G. Bush said plainly that, following a solution of the crisis, the United States' forces would be withdrawn.

[Belyayev] But under conditions where Iraq possesses weapons of mass destruction and, to judge from everything, is not far from joining the nuclear "club," can it be

considered that merely the withdrawal of its forces from Kuwait will fully normalize the situation?

[Primakov] No, it cannot. All the problems that you raise in your question are very serious and they worry the world community since Iraq's now considerable military potential is associated with the fact that it really could be used against neighboring countries. No one, under such conditions without additional measures, could be fully guaranteed against such a practicability becoming a fact. For this reason the Soviet Union—and this idea was also reflected in the Soviet-American joint statement in Helsinki—is endeavoring to ensure that the elimination of the Kuwait crisis give a considerable boost to the creation of a system of strategic security in the region. It is a question, naturally, of the whole of the Near East, Israel included.

Italian Prime Minister Andreotti and Foreign Minister De Michelis focused attention in discussions with me, for example, on the need to carry over to the Near East the "Helsinki experience." This idea merits attention, it seems to me. But, of course, there can be no mechanical "transference" here since the main thing in the "Helsinki security arrangement" was the fixing of postwar borders and a guarantee of their inviolability. Until the Israeli-Arab conflict has been resolved, there is nothing to fix or, even less, guarantee in the Near East. There are also territorial problems between Turkey and Iraq and Turkey and Syria. They are in a smoldering state, currently, it is true, but there could be a flareup. In any event, interest in them would rise at the time of a fixing of all the borders of this region. This needs to be done, of course, but until the Israeli-Arab conflict has been resolved, there are no prospects of this.

[Belyayev] But a system of strategic security in the Near East is needed for all that.

[Primakov] And it should also incorporate—in the event it is created—aside from the designation of borders, questions connected with arms exports to this region and the association of the countries of the region with the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and their consent to the corresponding inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency and with their affiliation to the treaty—which will, I hope, shortly be signed in Geneva—banning the production of chemical weapons. A system of mutual pacts on nonaggression, on no first use of force and so forth could be provided for as well.

But there is the other side of the coin also. During my conversations with Saddam Husayn, I sensed—and this was not, it seems to me, put on—that he is really "charged" with the idea that Iraq has become, even "following the military victory" over Iran, practically a "fortress under siege." Saddam Husayn clearly evinces a "Masada complex," I would say. This was the last fortress holding out during the Jewish war, and its defenders, realizing the hopelessness of their position, declared their readiness to die, but not surrender. As far as I understood it, questions arise for Saddam Husayn in respect to the future also: Will not an attack be launched against Iraq even if it withdraws its forces from Kuwait? Will the economic sanctions be lifted if he withdraws his forces? These misgivings of Iraq's are being fueled by a number of statements from which it may be concluded that some of the people who are making an absolute of a military solution are making it their goal not only to force Iraq to quit Kuwait, but also to eliminate the former's current regime and are "forecasting" even the dismemberment of Iraq.

[Belyayev] At a joint news conference by the presidents of the USSR and France, while you were in the Near East, Mikhail Sergeyevich said that, in his opinion, the Arab factor should at this time be stepped up for the purpose of a political settlement. This statement, to judge by the reaction of the press, came as a surprise and has, it has seemed to me, been perceived ambivalently in many countries.

[Primakov] This ambivalence has been caused mainly by the pointed commentaries of certain news agencies. In actual fact, it is not a question of a proposal for a shifting onto the Arabs themselves of the whole responsibility for an untying of the "Kuwait knot" and of everything connected to it. By no means. At the present time, the active participation of the Arabs could advance a political settlement of the problems that have arisen, however, given an obligatory arrangement concerning the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait, of course. Arab initiatives cannot be seen "in isolation" from the efforts being made by the whole world community, primarily the five permanent members of the UN Security Council.

The following argument is sometimes adduced also: The Arab world is divided, and some unanimity is not to be expected, a common decision even less. Indeed, the attitude toward the Iraqi intervention in Kuwait has created a kind of divide separating the Arab world into two parts. An arithmetical majority of governments of Arab states opposed the Iraqi action. From my viewpoint, the attitude toward Iraq at the present time of the broad masses in the Arab countries presents a different picture. Some people are impressed that Iraq has thrown down the gauntlet to the "all-powerful" West. Others, because the Iraqi leadership has spread the "Palestinian carpet" beneath its actions, declares its intention of strictly linking the withdrawal of its forces with a solution of the Palestinian problem. One way or another, the picture in the Arab world is heterogeneous. And under these conditions the convening of a pan-Arab "summit"—I agree here with both Egyptian President Mubarak and King Fahd of Saudi Arabia—would obviously not be a "panacea." It cannot be ruled out that things would boil down to a demonstration of disagreements, mutual recrimination, and digressions into the past to prove the "rightness" of one's position. But there is, after all, more than just the one form of Arab action in the shape of a "summit" meeting. There is both the Arab League and the possibility of a pooling of efforts in other manifestations also.

[Belyayev] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, we have been talking the whole time about the political aspect of the efforts being made by the Soviet Union. But there is, after all, a further problem troubling us all. Your trip to the Near East was also connected with the need to secure the safe departure from Iraq of all Soviet people who wish to leave. We know from the brief TASS statement merely that agreement was reached with the Iraqi president on the fact that all Soviet citizens who wish to return home may do so. And no more. No details. Could you not dwell on this in more detail?

[Primakov] During our first trip—I went to Baghdad at that time with I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers—we raised the question of the departure of Soviet specialists for home—for whoever so wished, naturally. The question did come out of the blue.... Repeated attempts to come to an arrangement on this with the Iraqi authorities had not led to any positive results. Aeroflot had even ceased scheduled flights to Baghdad since there were no passengers for the return journey to Moscow. Comrade I.S. Belousov and I were able during our first meeting with Saddam Husayn to make considerable progress in the solution of this question. He declared that Soviet people were not being detained by the Iraqi authorities for political reasons. A timetable for the departure of 1,500 of our specialists within a month, that is, before 5 November, was established.

I have to say that this timetable has been observed unswervingly. But there were, after all, 5,000 of our compatriots in Iraq. And a particular approach on the part of the Iraqi authorities was revealed in respect of Soviet military specialists. Approaching the time of the second visit to Baghdad, 36 military specialists, the terms of whose contracts had been completed, were virtually taken off the aircraft even after they had complied with formalities and completed their exit papers. All this gave rise to nervousness in the Soviet colony, particularly in Southern Iraq.

During my second meeting with the Iraqi president, I was insistent—I had direct instructions from the president of the USSR on this score—on the need for the solution of all questions connected with Soviet people. In my presence Saddam Husayn summoned his secretary and instructed him to abide unswervingly by the decision to the effect that none of the Soviet people wishing to return home must be detained in Iraq. A specific instruction was given in respect to the military specialists—all those who had completed their contracts would also return home. The 36 military specialists whom I have already mentioned arrived in Moscow on an Aeroflot aircraft in the morning of 2 November. A new, supplementary timetable for the departure before the end of November of a further 1,000 Soviet citizens was drawn up. The figure is in excess, incidentally, of the number of exit applications submitted to Soviet organizations in Iraq by our specialists. Thus 2,500 persons will have returned home from 5 October through the end of November. In accordance with the agreement that was reached, the number of departures will not now be limited. It will all depend solely on the desire to leave Iraq of this specialist or the other of ours.

[Belyayev] There have been rumors to the effect that you brought back with you from Baghdad one of our specialists, who had been held for 30 months by the Iraqi authorities because of a traffic accident that had resulted in casualties. If this is the case, please describe what happened in more detail. I am sure that the readers need to know about this.

[Primakov] Yes, this was the case. An Iraqi court had twice found a driver of ours (an inhabitant of Kiev) in Iraq on contract not guilty. But, nonetheless, he was not allowed to leave the country, the case being sent back continually for further examination. The man was completely worn out. He had lived there alone, without his family. He was on the verge of a nervous breakdown. In accordance with Mikhail Sergeyevich's instructions, I raised this matter separately during my talks with the president of Iraq. After all, the fate of each Soviet citizen, even more one in such a critical position, is of the most immense importance. The president of Iraq settled this question positively also. Our driver, who flew with me from Baghdad, is now with his beloved in the Ukraine.

But it is not, after all, just a question of our people, although their fate concerns us first and foremost, naturally. I raised before Saddam Husayn the problem of the release of foreign hostages from the United States, Europe, and Japan. I have not lost hope that the Iraqi leadership will rethink this problem also.

[Belyayev] Your trip has been extensively covered throughout the world. There have even been notes of dramatic effect in this coverage, particularly at the time when Yu.M. Vorontsov, Soviet representative at the United Nations, referring to you, requested a two-day postponement of the adoption of a new Security Council resolution on Iraq. What was behind all this?

[Primakov] It was not at all a question of dramatic effect here. I did, indeed, request postponement from Saturday, 27 October, to Monday, 29 October, of the vote in the Security Council on this resolution. In raising this question I did not, of course, think that one conversation with Saddam Husayn, which was to have taken place on Sunday, might have created a breakthrough in the entire situation. But it seemed to me that such a postponement could, possibly, have created a favorable reading for the talks in Baghdad. So it did, most likely, in general. But since as we did not receive a real signal on Iraq's readiness to withdraw its forces from Kuwait, the voting last Monday took place. And the Soviet representative was even a sponsor of the resolution. This, it seems to me, expresses the scrupulousness of our position. We are for the achievement of the set goal: the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait, but want, I repeat once more, to use for this all available political possibilities.

To speak about the reaction of the press in general, it has been, of course, ambivalent. The vast majority of the

mass media has adopted an understanding attitude toward the efforts made by the Soviet Union and has displayed an interest in their continuation. I am speaking in this case about both the Western and Arab newspapers and television.

Of course, the nervousness in certain Western countries in connection with the trip is understandable. I understand also the concern lest there be a split in the forces advocating a withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait, so that those who would like to keep their forces in the Persian Gulf region not take advantage of this. But the Soviet Union adheres strictly to the policy of the obligatory withdrawal of these forces following a resolution of the crisis there. The authors of some of them (sic) predicted the failure of political efforts, which, understandably, is required mainly to outline in greater contrast the military option as the sole prospect. There were also those who ascribed aims to the Soviet representative that had nothing in common with reality. Unfortunately, all this was to be found also in IZVESTIYA—in our semi-official newspaper—which preferred to comment on the trip of the special representative of the USSR president from Western sources.

[Belyayev] I would observe in conclusion that, following your numerous meetings and exchanges of opinion with such a wide range of world politicians and statesmen and heads of state and government and meetings with Saddam Husayn in Baghdad, chances of avoiding war in the Persian Gulf region remain. Such an outcome of the Soviet leadership's efforts to prevent war in the Persian Gulf region, which is literally next to our southern borders, would seem to me a big success. The withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait could, it seems to me, become a fact without war. Although, frankly, anxiety remains.

Syrian Stance on Gulf, U.S. Buildup Viewed

PM1311194590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Nov 90 Union Edition p 4

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent M. Kozhevnikov under the rubric: "Panorama of International Life": "Damascus' Choice"]

[Text] Damascus—The political atmosphere in Syria has been electrified by alarming reports from the Persian Gulf zone.

Will war break out in the Gulf or not? Will it be a long war or will the Americans be able to quickly drive the Iraqis out of occupied Kuwait? Will this be an armed clash between the United States and Iraq or will it develop into a large-scale regional conflict or maybe even a world war? All these questions are being keenly discussed at all levels here.

Let us recall. Virtually since the very beginning of the dramatic events in the Persian Gulf, Syria has condemned Iraq's aggression. Together with Egypt and Morocco, it sent an armed contingent to Saudi Arabia (there are around 20,000 Syrian servicemen there now as part of the international forces). Damascus consistently advocates the rigorous implementation of the international community's decisions.

At the same time, people here are watching with alarm the rapid buildup of the U.S. military presence in the Near East. Some Syrians I have spoken to have expressed grave fears that the United States intends to use the pretext of liberating Kuwaiti territory to completely smash Iraq's military-industrial potential and thereby "destroy one of the Arabs' last forces." That concern is intensified by the further military assistance being given by Washington to its main strategic ally in the region—Israel—which is causing a sharply negative reaction in Syria.

However, as recent events show, Syria continues to firmly adhere to its decision in this complex situation. Along with Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Morocco, it continues to represent a steadfast anti-Iraqi coalition in the international arena and supports collective efforts to resolve the crisis in the Gulf.

There was a meeting of the foreign ministers of Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Syria in Damascus at the end of last week in the framework of those efforts.

As SANA [Syrian Arab News Agency] has reported, the three states' representatives discussed the situation in the Persian Gulf region and the efforts being undertaken by the international community to achieve a political settlement of the crisis there. They agreed on further coordinating actions and continuing consultations—specifically, the holding of a similar meeting in Cairo, before the visit to the region by U.S. President Bush, which, it is reported, is planned for 22 November.

Most political observers agree that the talks in Damascus were another attempt to find an "Arab solution" to the Gulf conflict and avoid a military solution. At the same time, according to a Radio Monte Carlo broadcast in Arabic, the participants in the tripartite meeting coordinated their positions in the event that the use of armed measures against Iraq becomes inevitable. In particular, they decided to demand that the United States give prompt notification of its decision to go to war. The three states' representatives expressed grave fears that civilians and the civilian infrastructure may be the victims of armed actions against Iraq. As the Radio Monte Carlo commentator noted, Egypt has been instructed to continue active consultations at the international level with the aim of seeking political solutions. It was announced that Syria's President al-Asad will visit Cairo in the near future as part of the coordination of the actions of the Arab countries belonging to the anti-Iraq coalition.

TASS Summarizes Persian Gulf Developments

LD0911114990 Moscow TASS in English 1123 GMT 9 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Malyarov]

[Text] Cairo November 9 TASS—The International Food Programme Organisation (at the United Nations) has begun to stock up on "strategic reserves" of food in case of a Gulf war.

According to the semi-official Greek news agency ANA, storage facilities have already been set up on Cyprus and received the first 8,000 tonnes of food for supply to refugees who would inevitably outflow from a combat operations area.

U.N. experts believe that the main stream of refugees from a combat operations area in the Gulf would go to such countries as Egypt, Jordan and Turkey which, clearly, would not be able to feed them.

Iraqi leader Saddam Husayn has released another 50 hostages from among Western countries' citizens held in Iraq as a "human shield". According to the president's order, the right to leave Iraq was granted to 20 Germans, 15 Italians, 10 Dutchmen and five Britons.

Egyptian President Husni Mubarak told journalists that all Egyptian military advisers who worked in Iraq have now returned home. He pointed out that 34 Egyptian instructor pilots were the last to be released.

An "Arab source in the Gulf" told journalists that Iraq is urgently developing and preparing for the production a new type of bacteriological weapon.

According to the source, Iraqi specialists have completed the laboratory-stage development of a new super-active compound including the agents of Anthrax, Pneumonia and a whole number of skin diseases.

An acute shortage of food and medicines is felt in Iraq, reports the latest communique issued by the "Committees for the National Salvation of Iraq"—an Iraqi opposition organisation that emerged following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

The communique also points out that the shortage of natural gas and fuel oil that are used in Iraq for domestic heating is also having its effect of late.

The Arab Lawyers' Federation favours a peaceful settlement of the Gulf conflict. A peaceful settlement should be achieved on the basis of complete and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait and restoration of law and order in that Arab country, says a statement, circulated here, by the federation's general secretary.

Effect of Gulf Crisis on Saudi Life Viewed

PM0911144790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Nov 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondent V. Belyakov: "Persian Gulf: Peace Disturbed"]

[Text] Riyadh, November—On the third floor of the Dhahran International Hotel, which is directly opposite the international airport in Dhahran, one hears many languages being spoken late into the night. The combined press center of the Saudi information and defense ministries and of the "Desert Shield" operations staff has been set up there. During the three months of the operation to transfer U.S. forces to Saudi Arabia, over 1,000 journalists have been accredited at the press center. Some 250-300 of them are in Dhahran on a permanent basis.

The Saudis find the army of correspondents a great problem, but the multinational force itself is giving them even more trouble. What impelled them to invite it in was the Iraqi occupation of neighboring Kuwait, which was accomplished in a matter of hours. Of course, Saudi Arabia is far bigger than its occupied neighbor in terms of territory, population, and military economic potential. But, since it possesses an army of only 65,000 men, the kingdom was clearly not in a position to defend itself in the event of the spread of aggression south—which is where the celebrated Saudi oilfields are. The experienced reader might ask: So where are the ultramodern weapons on which Saudi Arabia has spent tens of billions of dollars in recent years? A large number of these weapons have simply not been assimilated. A British businessman who knows about these things told me in Riyadh that most of the military equipment had been placed in underground storage and had not reached the forces.

Saudi officials claim that the threat of an Iraqi invasion of the kingdom was real and evaporated only when the multinational force appeared on its territory. Not all my foreign colleagues in Dhahran agree with this assessment. Some of them reckon that if Iraq had really intended to seize the Saudi oilfields it would have launched an offensive toward the south immediately after the occupation of Kuwait and would have reached Dhahran in two-three days. But everyone agrees that the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait left Saudi Arabia in a state of shock.

Thousands of Saudis dashed to the banks to withdraw their assets. During August, according to official data, bank deposits fell by more than $3 billion. The demand for radios soared. In the conditions of a dynamically developing situation newspapers were no longer enough. Many foreign workers in the Eastern Province, adjoining Kuwait, were scared that there might be a war. Over 1,000 of the 12,000 foreigners working for the "Aramco" oil company hastily resigned and went home. In order to keep its staff, the company had to increase their pay by 15 percent as of 1 October. Add to that the tens of thousands of Kuwaiti refugees, headed by the emir himself. It was in this anxious situation that the Saudi government decided to invite foreign forces into the country.

None of the Saudis I have spoken with questioned the correctness of this decision. However, according to Western journalists working in Dhahran there are people who do disgree with it. Their objection is that it was

primarily infidels who were summoned to defend the kingdom, and, consequently, the holy places of Islam on its territory.

But what I sensed in my conversations was the Saudis' desire to resolve the crisis as soon as possible, preferably peacefully, and bid farewell to their defenders.

Looked at from the purely economic viewpoint, according to 'Abdallah Dabbagh, general secretary of the Saudi Union of Chambers of Trade and Industry, at the moment the crisis is stimulating, rather than damaging the Saudi economy. The sharp rise in oil prices compensates for the increased military expenditure. Local enterprises have received extra orders for supplies of goods for the multinational force. Because of the influx of Kuwaiti refugees, most of whom left the country without any baggage but receive substantial monthly sums from the government to maintain them, turnover of merchandise has increased. There is a brisk trade in souvenirs in the capital's bazaar. The customers are mainly foreign officers. The hotel trade, housing sector, and vehicle hire business are booming. But there is also a downside. The rate of capital investment has markedly declined. Potential investors—local and foreign—are waiting to see the outcome of the crisis.

All in all, from an economic viewpoint, the country is in a position to bear the burden of the crisis in the Persian Gulf for a relatively long period without suffering any damage. Particularly when you consider that its foreign capital investments are estimated at $200 billion. But the effect on the Saudis' day-to-day life of 250,000 Kuwaiti refugees and a similar number of Western servicemen creates more complex, although not always immediately apparent problems.

The Saudi kingdom's strength is in its unswerving observance of traditions. These traditions appear obsolete, even archaic. The absence of movie theaters and other spectacles, the "dry law," women wearing the veil, prohibited from going out of the house alone, working in the same room as a man, or driving a car. It is the same in political life. The kingdom is an absolute monarchy. The king is the head of government. The crown prince is the first deputy prime minister. There is no parliament, no constitution, no political parties, no elected local organs of power, no trade unions even. But the Saudis do not intend to change any of this. Moreover, they believe that if they were to change just one tradition there would be a chain reaction that would begin to erode the society. Permit a woman to remove the veil today, and tomorrow she would be demanding equality. Allow trade unions to be set up, and the question of a parliament and a constitution would soon be on the agenda.

This philosophy and way of life would scarcely have remained unchanged until the end of the 20th century had it not been reinforced by the authorities' concern for their subjects' needs, based on the massive revenue from oil exports. In the kingdom you have very high pay and a short working day. Education and health care are free. Transport is cheap. It is pretty easy to get a bank loan to be able to build your own house or set up a business. Everyone is guaranteed a minimum living standard that is pretty high by world standards.

The situation is similar in Kuwait, but there the traditions are being eroded. The Kuwaiti national congress which was held in mid-October in the Saudi city of Jeddah discussed the restoration of the constitution and parliament following the country's liberation. Kuwaiti women, although they wear their black cloaks, have long since forgotten what a veil is and are well versed in cosmetics. I have noticed this more than once, strolling through Riyadh in the evening. I have also seen the looks of horror on Saudis' faces and the way the religious police—the mutawwa'—avoid them in embarrassment. They are ordered not to touch Kuwaiti women, because they are exiles.

They are also ordered not to touch other foreigners, particularly those in uniform. The Americans are behaving properly, but they are like visitors from another world. Everyone talks about the U.S. Army women, who share all the hardships of service and camp life with the men. The direct opposite to Saudi women!

All this intrudes daily into the Saudis' established life and disturbs their peace. People are praying to Allah to ensure that the crisis ends as soon as possible and everything returns to normal. But the Saudis are not only praying. They are undergoing a crash course in military training. In time these people could well replace a considerable part of the multinational force.

There are other problems which stand out, but which are no less complex for that. Nearly one-half of the Arab states disapproved of the appearance of U.S. forces on Saudi soil. Including neighboring Jordan and Yemen, with which Saudi Arabia has had close ties for decades. Now they are being broken, and this process is having a bad effect on the Saudis as well.

Such are today's realities in Saudi Arabia, which, by force of circumstances, has been turned into a frontline state.

Prospects for Broader Saudi Ties Foreseen

PM1411104990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent V. Belyakov: "Wishes Alone Are Not Enough. On the Prospects for Soviet-Saudi Ties"]

[Text] Riyadh—In the aircraft en route from Cairo to Riyadh I leafed through a magazine published for passengers of the Saudi airline. One of the beautifully illustrated articles was devoted to philately. Among the stamps of various countries I also found Soviet ones. However, the inscription beneath them read: "U.S. stamps." Some two days later the newspaper AL-RIYAD carried a photograph of a building with a turret, on

whose facade it was possible to read without difficulty: "Airport." However, the editors reckoned that it was a Soviet mosque.

"None of my staffers knows Russian," AL-RIYAD Chief Editor Turki al-Sudayri shrugged.

There are just a handful of people in the kingdom who know Russian. The first 10 students began studying Russian in the King Sa'ud University in Riyadh only this academic year. And all because for more than half a century ties between our states were practically severed.

However, Saudi Arabia was the first Arab country with which the Soviet Union established diplomatic relations back in February 1926. That event was linked with the name of the Soviet diplomat Kerim Khakimov, whom the Saudis remember to this day. Initially he was our first consul and then ambassador, and he became friendly with King Ibn-Sa'ud. But in 1937 Khakimov was unexpectedly summoned to Moscow, tried as an "enemy of the people," and executed. The king was very upset to learn about this and declared that he did not want another ambassador. Moscow responded by cutting the staff of the Soviet mission in the kingdom. While not formally severed, Soviet-Saudi relations fell victim to Stalinist repressions.

I believe that the abnormality of such a situation became clear both to us and to the Saudis long ago. But, as is known, it is always easier to demolish than to build. It took long years to take the decisive step. And then, on 17 September, diplomatic relations between the USSR and Saudi Arabia were at last restored.

Analyzing the factors which contributed to this, AL-RIYAD names the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan as the first of them. Then it singles out "President Gorbachev's policy, which is characterized by openness and flexibility and differs from communist ideology in its former interpretation." The third factor is that Soviet Muslims have begun enjoying freedom of religion. At the same time, in AL-RIYAD's opinion, this event was accelerated by the crisis in the Persian Gulf region. The Saudis welcomed the fact that, despite close ties with Iraq, the Soviet Union roundly condemned the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait and, together with the other permanent members of the UN Security Council, advocated the use of economic sanctions against Baghdad.

During his visit to Moscow in mid-September, when the restoration of diplomatic relations was announced, Foreign Minister Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal pointed out that he was counting on broad multifaceted cooperation between our states. Since the economy is our headache today, the first thing I did upon flying into Riyadh was to ask for a meeting to be arranged for me with 'Abdallah al-Dabbagh, general secretary of the Union of Chambers of Commerce and Industry. He is a well-known and influential man in the kingdom. The thing is that the Saudis preach the philosophy of a U.S.-style "free economy." The government, for example, imports only weapons, while the private sector buys everything else. It also owns the bulk of the enterprises, except for the largest ones. So in the sphere of economic ties we will have to deal primarily with the Saudi private businessman. And the organization headed by Al-Dabbagh unites all "businessmen"—traders, industrialists, bankers. It also represents their interests to the government.

In Al-Dabbagh's opinion, the opportunities for trade and economic ties between the two states are very favorable. To take trade, the Saudis are ready to supply us with chemicals and construction materials above all. They in turn are interested in our agricultural equipment and motor vehicles. Experts are to make a more detailed assessment following a mutual study of the markets.

Another promising sphere, my interlocutor believes, is joint projects. True, he is not sure that Soviet legislation is favorable enough to foreign investors, but he hopes that appropriate conditions will be created in the course of implementing the economic reform. Al-Dabbagh named the petrochemical and defense industries as likely areas for joint ventures to operate.

My interlocutor mentioned that wishes alone are not enough and that appropriate mechanisms are also needed. Above all, the opening of trade missions after the embassies and maybe also the creation of a mixed chamber of commerce and industry. In his opinion, it would be useful to hold reciprocal exhibitions of export commodities.

The areas and mechanisms of Soviet-Saudi economic cooperation were discussed during the late-October visit to the kingdom of a Soviet delegation headed by K.F. Katushev, minister of foreign economic relations. This was the first visit to Saudi Arabia by our minister following the restoration of diplomatic relations—which in itself attests to the desire of both states to develop economic cooperation between themselves. The delegation was received by King Fahd. An accord on the mutual granting of most-favored-nation status in trade and on the opening of a Soviet trade mission in Riyadh was reached during the talks. As K.F. Katushev told Saudi journalists, the visit was very fruitful.

My first meeting at the Union of Chambers of Commerce and Industry was followed by several others—with officials, businessmen, scientists, journalists. The tone of these meetings was invariably distinguished by friendliness, and my interlocutors voiced confidence in the need to vigorously develop Saudi-Soviet ties. "We must as quickly as possible make up for the time lost during the previous 52 years," one of them remarked. It is impossible to disagree with such an assessment. At any rate, there are no longer any obstacles to this.

Iran's Position on Iraq Remains Unchanged

TA1311184790 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The slogan "Death to Saddam the traitor" has been removed from the political lexicon of Iran's government figures and mass media. According to Tehran radio, this slogan has even been deleted from the recorded speech in 1980 by Ayatollah Khomeyni, the late leader of the Islamic Revolution, on the occasion of the launching of Iraq's aggression against Iran.

Tehran radio explained that after the Iraqi president accepted Iran's conditions for resolving the two sides' dispute, he no longer deserves the title traitor. Our commentator writes on this:

Naturally, from the viewpoint of observers, Tehran radio's report falls within the framework of the Gulf crisis, which has been created as a result of Iraq's occupation of Kuwait. Some commentators believe that removal of the label of traitor from Saddam Husayn reflects a compromise by Iran toward the adoption of decisive measures against the occupiers. I do not believe so.

Tehran's official position has remained unchanged. Iran supports UN sanctions against Iraq. Iran does not even intend to compromise with the aggressor in return for Baghdad's concessions with regard to settling the Iran-Iraq dispute. Iran's UN delegation has categorically denied rumors to the effect that Tehran is ready to accept Iraq's oil as compensation for the damages inflicted by Iraq on Iran during the war years. Iran's delegation, refuting reports on this by the ABC television network, asserted in a special statement that the Islamic republic is observing UN sanctions against Iraq and insists on the unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait. In short, there is no basis for talk about some sort of opportunism by Iran.

If one considers the real situation in Iran, there is another problem there, namely, the continuing rivalry between the conservative fundamentalist forces and the supporters of democratizing the country's domestic and foreign policy. The conservatives, who at one time were pursuing the policy of prolonging the Iran-Iraq war, today are displaying the utmost tolerance toward Kuwait's occupation by Iraq. They believe that this development does not endanger Islam. They see this danger in the deployment of multinational forces, mainly made up of U.S. troops, in the Persian Gulf region.

The fundamentalists, by using the pretext of the danger posed to Islam by the multinational forces, are preventing the implementation of political and economic reforms in the country and the revamping of its foreign policy. In contrast, those who favor the democratization of society and Iran's emergence from international isolation stress the necessity of active cooperation with the United Nations in confronting Iraq's aggression. The deployment of foreign forces in the Gulf arouses their concern, but they perceive the principal reason for tension in the region to be Baghdad's intransigence and adventurism.

The opponents of the fundamentalists believe that Iraq's aggression does not serve the interests of any of the littoral states. Although they prefer a political solution of the Gulf crisis, they support decisive measures to invalidate the consequences of aggression. The majority of Soviet citizens support them in this matter.

18,000 Soviet Jews Seek Return From Israel

91P50033A

[Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA of 31 October 1990 carries in its second edition on page 3 an article entitled "They Want To Return Home" stating that based on the reporting of the Israeli newspaper DAVAR, 18,000 Soviet Jews have applied to the Soviet Consulate to return to the USSR from Israel. The main reasons cited for the immigrants' desire to return are "dissatisfaction with the work situation, disappointment with the Israeli way of life, and nonfulfillment of the many hopes which prompted departure." The immigrants were also motivated to leave Israel because of difficulties in living accommodations and financial constraints.

IZVESTIYA Interviews Afghan President

PM1011184990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Nov 90 Union Edition p 5

[Interview with Afghan President Najibullah by IZVESTIYA and IAN special correspondents K. Geyvandov and A. Bogomolov; place and date not given: "The Offensive Against Kabul Failed"—first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] We visited the Republic of Afghanistan with a group of Soviet journalists. Toward the end of the tour we had two meetings with President Najibullah and interviewed him for IZVESTIYA. The 43-year-old leader of the Republic of Afghanistan is a tall, thickset guy with slicked-back black hair already showing threads of silvery gray. He behaved confidently and unaffectedly, without the slightest hint of constraint or tension. He cracked occasional jokes. This, we thought, is precisely the behavior of a leader who feels that the hardest is over and that the regime has succeeded in holding out in a difficult military confrontation and in strengthening its positions step by step. Here is what he replied to the questions put to him.

[IZVESTIYA] During our seven-day stay in Afghanistan we have visited many other regions in addition to Kabul and its environs, but nowhere have we detected signs of hostilities. Nevertheless, Western mass media have recently been saying and writing a lot about the escalation of tension in Afghanistan connected with the armed opposition's plan to mount an offensive against Kabul and other cities in the country. Were those plans put into effect, what were their results, and who drew them up and implemented them and how?

[Najibullah] Attempts really were made recently to put such plans into effect. And it has to be said, above all, that those actions by extremist opposition leaders were carried out with the help of Pakistan's ruling circles. They attest to concern at the fact that with every passing day not only the ordinary people in Afghanistan but also some field commanders and leaders of opposition groupings are becoming increasingly aware of the correctness and necessity of the policy of national reconciliation.

It can already be boldly stated that the armed opposition's plans for a new offensive, this time against Kabul, failed. Units and subunits of the Republic of Afghanistan Armed Forces not only repulsed that offensive decisively but also dislodged the opposition from many positions and points.

Special mention must be made to the continuing interference in our affairs by the Pakistani military. While the process of the peaceful settlement of the crisis is under way in Afghanistan, it invites some of the opposition's field commanders to Pakistan and draws up plans based on a military solution to the question. Today even certain commanders of opposition groupings in Pakistan recognize the fact of that country's interference in Afghanistan's affairs and the anti-Afghan nature of the actions of the Pakistani ruling circles.

[IZVESTIYA] In the past decade our countries have lived through dramatic and at times also tragic events which have linked the destinies of their peoples. What, in your view, are the further prospects for expanding Afghan-Soviet relations, particularly in the economic sphere? Many people in our country criticize the government for the assistance being given to developing countries, including Afghanistan, at a time when the economy of the Soviet Union itself is in a crisis state. It is evidently more appropriate now to speak not of unilateral assistance but of cooperation. Could you outline the prospects for mutually advantageous Afghan-Soviet economic cooperation?

[Najibullah] As you mentioned in your question, our countries have been through dramatic and tragic events together over the past 10 years. And this means that the Afghan people need the all-around support of the Soviet Union as a great neighboring state in the matter of ensuring peace and reviving the country after a bloody war.

As for Soviet-Afghan economic ties, it must be said that they have a long history. And they have always developed on the basis of the principle of mutual advantage. Unfortunately, certain spheres of our economic ties with the Soviet Union were damaged as a result of the war. But we are sure that there are good prospects for restoring and expanding mutually advantageous cooperation.

It appears that Afghanistan, possessing considerable natural wealth and given cooperation with the Soviet side, could very quickly significantly increase the volume of exports of commodities that the Soviet people need. Afghan entrepreneurs are ready to develop trade and economic ties with Soviet partners, basing transactions on freely convertible currency, and are ready to set up joint ventures and to strengthen direct ties. Thus, 44 contracts worth $14 million were concluded in 1990 between Afghan merchants and Soviet organizations, with payment in freely convertible currency. Assistance from Soviet specialists could also promote the development of mutually advantageous ties. Soviet specialists have already come to Afghanistan to prepare for the resumption of exports of natural gas to the USSR. It is intended to export 300 million cubic meters of gas to the Soviet Union during December through February.

In short, we are firmly confident that it is necessary to not only preserve but also comprehensively develop and improve on a new qualitative level that established friendly ties and cooperation between our neighboring countries and peoples.

[IZVESTIYA] You know that the Soviet Union's participation in the Afghan war provoked different reactions in our country. A considerable section of our society condemned the sending of Soviet troops to Afghanistan, and their withdrawal satisfied the entire people. The problem of the missing soldiers and of those whom we know to be in captivity, however, remains an open wound for us. What is the Afghan Government doing for their release? Tell us in greater detail what the mothers and relatives of captured soldiers can hope for.

[Najibullah] With due regard for the aspirations of the Afghan and Soviet peoples, the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan created all the conditions for the withdrawal of the contingent of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, seeking to end for the Soviet people the tragedy of the war, of human casualties, and of the deaths of soldiers and officers. But, unfortunately, the war and the bloodshed have continued in Afghanistan even after the Soviet troop withdrawal. Every day many Afghans die or are crippled, although the policy of national reconciliation is slowly, yet surely, making its way into the hearts of our people.

We believe that the release of the Soviet soldiers who are still held captive by the opposition is the number one task for us. We are taking all possible measures to fulfill it, despite the fact that we sometimes encounter difficulties created in the most unexpected quarters—for example, the statements published recently in your youth newspapers.

The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan has made a tremendous effort over the past year and secured the release of eight Soviet prisoners of war. Incidentally, in exchange for two of your soldiers released in Pakistan our government released 25 Pakistani prisoners, eight opposition field commanders, and two Arab mercenaries. Together with the mothers and fathers of Soviet prisoners of war we feel their sorrow and sadness. I

personally wish to assure you that the Afghan Government is continuing its efforts and utilizing all available opportunities and means for the release of the remaining Soviet prisoners of war.

We hope that the Soviet public organizations and ordinary people tackling this problem will cooperate with the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan, and we believe that these joint efforts will yield positive results.

Foreign Ministry Collegium Eyes Afghan POW Issue

PM1311111990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 90 Union Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "At USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium"]

[Text] As the USSR Foreign Ministry has reported to us, a session of the Foreign Ministry collegium was held 11 November under the chairmanship of E.A. Shevardnadze. One of the main questions examined at the collegium was the fate of the Soviet prisoners of war in Afghanistan. A report on this theme was delivered by deputy minister A.M. Belonogov.

The collegium adopted a decision to create a special working group which will study these questions together with the Defense Ministry, the KGB, and the Union of Societies of the Red Cross and the Red Crescent. As the Foreign Ministry told us, the group's duties include developing and supporting the coordinated action of those departments in looking for and securing the release of Soviet prisoners of war and maintaining close contacts with the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for internationalist servicemen's affairs and with social organizations....

Pakistani President Cited on Ties With Neighbors

PM1311163390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Article by TASS correspondent N. Semenenko: "Pakistani President: No Tension in Relations with the USSR"]

[Text] Islamabad, 8 Nov—There is no tension in our relations with the Soviet Union, Pakistan's great neighbor, which played an important role in the cause of our country's industrialization. The fact that cooperation between our two states is being further developed and deepened is a reason for hope, President Ghulam Ishaq Khan of Pakistan declared today at a joint session of both houses of parliament.

The cornerstone of Pakistan's foreign policy, he pointed out, is solidarity with Muslim states, primarily with Saudi Arabia, Iran, Turkey, Bangladesh, and the Persian Gulf countries. We will seek to strengthen the traditional friendship with China, afriendship which is a fundamental factor in maintaining peace and stability in the region. According to him, Pakistani-U.S. ties are built on a coincidence of interests and values, as well as on a commonality of views on questions of regional security. The new government of Pakistan will make efforts in the cause of a political settlement of the Afghan problem. The Afghans must be granted the right to choose the political system and the government themselves. Pakistan does not want war with India, the president emphasized, but considers it its duty to give moral and political support to "the risen Muslim population of Kashmir."

Ryzhkov Congratulates New Pakistani Premier

LD1211204890 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 12 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov has sent congratulations to Mohammad Nawaz Sharif on his election as prime minister of Pakistan.

Ryzhkov's telegram expresses hope that the development of Soviet-Pakistani relations "will become an important element of the new structure of interstate cooperation, shaping up in the world, and promote stronger mutual understanding between the two countries, universal security and peoples' well-being".

Gorbachev Receives Sudanese Envoy's Credentials

EA1211195690 Khartoum SUNA in Arabic 1430 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Summary] Khartoum, 12 Nov (SUNA)—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev recently has received the credentials of the new Sudanese ambassador, Ibrahim Muhammad 'Ali.

East Europe

Yakovlev Receives Bulgarian President

LD1111075390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0718 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, 11 Nov (TASS)—Zhelyu Zhelev, the president of the People's Republic of Bulgaria [PRB] was in Moscow yesterday on a stopover on the way to Tokyo. He met Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the USSR Presidential Council.

During the course of the conversation which took place in a friendly atmosphere, several issues relating to Soviet-Bulgarian relations were discussed. Mutual conviction was expressed about the necessity for improving bilateral cooperation and for renewing its contractual and legal basis under the conditions of the radical democratic transformations being carried out in the USSR and the PRB, as well as for the development of links between the two countries on the basis of equal rights and mutual advantage, taking into account the real interests and possibilities of the sides.

An exchange of opinions on international issues confirmed the community of views of the sides in their appraisal of the main tendencies in world politics. The

readiness was noted of the USSR and the PRB to aid to the utmost the positive development of the pan-European process—of which the forthcoming Paris summit meeting of the CSCE member states should become an important landmark. In this context several aspects of the role and place of the Warsaw Pact in the system of pan-European security were touched upon.

CSFR Premier Speaks on Border Relations

LD1011063190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Report by correspondent Aleksandr Samylin from Bratislava]

[Text] [Announcer] Almost panic rumors have been spreading for more than a month in Slovakia of a possible mass invasion by Soviet tourists if the border restrictions are eased. Our correspondent Aleksandr Samylin reports from Bratislava:

[Samylin] There is a special interest toward this problem among the people of the eastern parts of Slovakia.

So it is only natural that Czechoslovak premier Marian Calfa, when addressing a meeting in the town of Michalovce on his visit to the Soviet Union, spoke on the issue of border relations.

He cited the words of Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov that the issue of opening up the borders will arouse acute debate in the parliaemnt. The Soviet prime minister reassured the Czechoslovak premier by telling him of the possible measures that may be taken to regulate exists from the Soviet Union.

But, as Marian Calfa noted, the CSFR is going to take its own counter-measures. We will ourselves check to see whether the Soviet citizens have been issued with proper exit documents, ask for the aim of their visit and, the main thing, ask on their currency backup, said Marian Calfa. It should not be forgotten that Soviet tourists, beginning the New Year, are obliged to have hard currency and we will check at the border whether they have enough currency and whether they, so to speak, have a return ticket except when it is a transit journey through Czechoslovakia.

In general, I think that there is no reason for our citizens to panic. The rumors have been plainly blown out of proportion.

Marian Calfa disagreed with some Slovak leaders who use as an ace card, the future relaxation of border restrictions between our countries in an attempt to gain support for the measures they are undertaking in an attempt to resolve complex internal issues.

Talks Held on Troop Withdrawal From CSFR

LD1111114390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2325 GMT 10 nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Anatoliy Shapovalov]

[Text] Prague, November 11 (TASS)—The talks, agreed on by both sides, which were held by CSFR and USSR expert groups from 5 November concluded here on Saturday. Under discussion were issues concerning property and finance in connection with the implemention of the intergovernmental agreement on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from CSFR territory, which was signed in Moscow at the end of last February. All issues concerning the implementation of this agreement were also discussed. At the end of the talks appropriate documents were signed.

The talks passed in a friendly and constructive atmosphere combined with respect for the interests of each side. The talks again confirmed the joint intention of both sides to resolve the existing issues in a spirit of trust and mutual cooperation.

The delegations were headed by V. Wagner, CSFR deputy foreign minister, and Yu. Grishin, USSR deputy minister of foreign economic realtions. The CSFR delegation also included a group of members of the Federal Assembly and of the Czech National Council; this group was headed by M. Kocab, who is the leader of the parliamentary commission for monitoring the withdrawal of Soviet troops from CSFR territory.

West Europe

Shevardnadze Lauds Gorbachev's FRG Visit

LD1111173390 Berlin ADN International Service in German 1620 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] Halle (ADN)—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has described as very successful the results of the German-Soviet summit held over the weekend. Speaking to the Halle-based 'MITTELDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG' (Monday edition), he described the Grand Treaty signed by Bonn and Moscow as historic. It forms the foundation for new relations between the two peoples. The desire for cooperation is bilateral, Shevardnadze said. It is necessary for Germany and the USSR to work closely together in shaping a new Europe. Both countries are destined toward this cooperation.

In answer to whether the Kremlin's policy on Germany is accepted in the Soviet Union, Shevardnadze said the fact that it has opponents makes the work interesting. One must defend a policy vigorously if one is convinced that it is right. The Soviet foreign minister said that the USSR is currently going through the most difficult phase of restructuring. It will take one and a half to two years. Gorbachev will stick it out.

Regarding his personal relationship with Federal Foreign Minister Genscher, Shevardnadze said: "I regard him as my friend." He has invited Genscher to pay a visit to his Georgian home.

FRG Said To Establish Economic Links

LD1211200990 Moscow TASS in English 1809 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS political analyst Aleksandr Antsiferov]

[Text] Moscow November 12 TASS—Praise lavished in the west on the results of the Soviet president's visit to Germany, in particular as regards prospects for the development of economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Germany, is clearly somewhat one-sided.

Western reaction stresses the Soviet Union's exclusive interest in arranging and strengthening these relations, while Germany is portrayed as a kind of sponsor, seeking to thank a partner for assisting in German unification, without hurting his feelings.

I believe that this approach, wittingly or unwittingly, ignores the fact that East Germany's integration into a single German state confronted the German leadership with problems, which are largely, if not fully, like those the Soviet Union is itself facing.

The transition to a market and related processes in Eastern Germany entail the same consequences as in the Soviet Union: Traditional links between producers are being disrupted, supply and demand are unbalanced and there is a slump in production.

In this respect, it can be said that Germany is going through its own restructuring, connected with Soviet perestroika not only historically but also economically.

It should be remembered that East Germany used to be the Soviet Union's biggest foreign trade partner among the Warsaw treaty member-countries, just as West Germany was its leading partner among NATO countries.

This circumstance largely determined the structure of export-import relations between the Soviet Union and the two German states, exercised a substantial influence on the international division of labour and engendered and strengthened the interdependence of the partners' economies.

In this situation, paradoxically, German unification changes little. The disruption of existing links would have most negative consequences both for the Soviet Union, and, to a no lesser degree, for Germany, which is facing the problem of selling products manufactured at enterprises of the former German Democratic Republic.

Millions of people in Eastern Germany will be affected by unemployment this year, and it is predicted that up to 20 percent of able-bodied Germans will lose their jobs.

Caused by economic concerns and announced in advance, higher rents and higher prices for electricity and communal services will surely be painful for East Germans, while western Germans will surely have to put up with the growth of taxes—tax hikes seem unavoidable, taking into account that, according to the parliamentary budget commission, German unification will cost 350 to 400 billion marks, an immense sum even for a rich country.

The situation is further exacerbated by the fact that there has been no expected influx of investments into the East German economy from European Community countries, on which Bonn counted so much. No increase of investment is likely to occur in the nearest future.

It is clear that it would be most unwise and unreasonable in this situation to ignore cooperation with the Soviet Union, which is a great stabilising factor from the economic viewpoint. Otherwise, Germany will have to limp on its eastern foot for a long time to come.

The conclusion prompts itself that Germany is vitally interested in a flourishing Soviet Union. In this context, German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher's words, said in a recent interview, acquire special significance: He said that when helping the Soviet Union to accomplish its reforms, Germany thinks not of any gifts to the east, but of investment into a joint future.

Reports, Comments View Soviet-German Treaty

Genscher Interviewed

LD1111110690 Moscow TASS in English 1058 GMT 11 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Semenov]

[Text] Bonn, November 11 TASS—The newly-signed German-Soviet treaty of good-neighbourly relations, partnership and cooperation demonstrates both countries' agreement about the need to put their bilateral relationship on a solid, long-term basis, German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher said on Saturday.

Speaking in an interview with Deutsche Welle radio, he said the relationship should be based on strong trust and encompass every field, incuding politics, the economy, ecology, culture and the maintenance of peace.

Germany and the Soviet Union realise, Genscher said, that their relations of trust, cooperation and even friendship are fundamentally important to the situation in Europe as a whole. This places giving great opportunities, he added.

Germany has given the Soviet Union considerable financial assistance this year to enable it to start economic reform, Genscher said. He urged other Western nations to follow suit because "the success of Gorbachev's reform policy is not merely his personal success or that of the USSR."

"The success of reforms will allow us to continue extensive cooperation as dynamically as now. It is imperative to understand this. We are basically interested in guaranteed

stability in the Soviet Union. This great country belongs to Europe, it is part of the continent," Genscher said.

Stabilising the situation in the USSR, he argued, is key to achieving stability throughout Europe and the West should help the Soviet Union.

Sitaryan Views Cooperation

LD1111000190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1847 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Interview with USSR Council of Ministers Presidium Deputy Chairman Stepan Sitaryan by correspondent V. Lyubovtsev on signing of Soviet-German cooperation treaties; place and date not given; from the "Topical Interview" program—recorded]

[Text] [Lyubovtsev] Academician Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the Soviet-German Bilateral Commission for Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation, what in your view is the significance of the documents that have been signed and how will their actual implementation begin?

[Sitaryan] Well, first of all, I would like to say that the FRG, and in the past the GDR, have been most important partners for our country. Approximately 15 percent of our country's entire foreign trade turnover involves them. The most important task is therefore not to lose what has been gained, and moreover to try and take these relations to a new level, working from the basis of the boundaries crossed in developing foreign economic relations with both the Federal Republic and the GDR, and to impart a new character and a new breath to those relations. It is not, of course, an easy task, but it is basically what the treaty was concluded for and what it has as its objective. I should like to note three trends of the document:

First, measures are envisaged here which should preserve all that was positive and of value in our bilateral relations with the GDR. We have an extensively ramified system of co-production, scientific and technical relations; and it is clear that we must not lose this under any circumstances, since it affects not only the interests of German enterprises but primarily those of our own enterprises, something that is of great concern to us. It is therefore very important that this document enshrines the principle of the protection of trust. This refers to observance of all those agreements that had been concluded between the Soviet Union and the GDR, and there are more than 120 such agreements. In this way, during the transitional period, we shall be doing everything possible to maintain these relations and on that basis to try to develop and deepen them further.

The second thing I should mention is that the document is primarily aimed at stepping up direct relations between the enterprises associations, and firms of the two countries. The main focus in foreign economic activity is now becoming the enterprise for us, too, and in this way the document provides a great deal of space for the vigorous activity of each enterprise that has the necessary conditions for organizing foreign economic relations.

Third, this document defines the precise directions of reciprocal cooperation to tackle extensive problems and projects, and I should like to point out above all such areas as power engineering; transport; communications; cooperation in converting military production; and, of course, on the part of the German side, aid to develop our consumer market. In this way the document is very interesting and substantial, and today, of course, the most important task is to complete it with concrete actions.

Literally, a few moments ago our meeting with the business circles of united Germany came to an end. Attending it were representatives of enterprises in the former GDR and firms in the FRG, and I have to say that the overall impression was that they have an enormous desire to develop relations, but, at the same time, they are concerned about certain negative processes currently under way in our country. They are all interested in one question today: Who are they to deal with? Who will assume liability when contracts are concluded, credits obtained, etc?

[Lyubovtsev] And who will actually be making use of the sums that are....

[Sitaryan, interrupting] Without a doubt, that is right. And no less than we are, they are interested in how efficiently that money will be used, since this is the basis of clearing the credits we are to obtain. I think this is a very serious question, and we shall act in such a way that these relations will be very reliable and do not create doubts for our German partners.

[Lyubovtsev] Stepan Aramaysovich, you are returning to Moscow today. What will be the first steps, the first measures to be undertaken in our country in order to make the most effective and rapid use of the credits and opportunities offered to us?

[Sitaryan] The first steps will indeed be practical ones. First, we have concluded a rather broad agreement on supplying food produce to our country. We must organize precisely the whole conveyor belt from procurement to transportation and delivery of these goods to the consumer. This, I think, is the first task facing us today, and we must resolve it this very day.

The second task is to conclude within the shortest period of time all contractual [obligations] with enterprises on the German side, and first and foremost with enterprises in the former GDR. They are worried, as of course are our Soviet enterprises which are linked with them by co-production ties. By the end of November, I think, we should finish this work: and further, of course, should start seriously to draw up the major cooperation projects I have already mentioned.

[Lyubovtsev] Many thanks.

Treaty's Effects Examined

PM1211132590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Article by Aleksandr Bovin under the rubric: "Political Diary": "Germany: Victory or Defeat?]

[Text] The documents regulating cooperation between the Soviet Union and Germany, which were signed Friday [9 November], open a new stage in the development of Soviet-German relations. Instead of GDR Germans and FRG Germans, our partners will again be "simply" Germans—the inhabitants of Germany.

The first time Germany was united by Bismarck, after he conquered France. The second time, 120 years later, by Gorbachev, after he conquered himself....

Judging by the letters which I receive, many Soviet people are alarmed by what is happening. They write that the passiveness of our foreign policy has led to the loss of East Europe and the swallowing up of the GDR by the Federal Republic and NATO; they write that the breakup of the Warsaw Pact and CEMA has impaired the international position of the USSR and weakened its security. It is possible, of course, and frequently even necessary, to put on a brave face if things are going badly, but there is no denying that, having allowed the FRG to seize the GDR and having allowed the West to incorporate GDR territory in NATO, we have suffered a political defeat. This is what many people write.

And I understand them. I respect their feelings. But after all, politics do not boil down to feelings. Is it a victory or a defeat? Psychologically, it is possible to pose this question. But the answer to it can be provided only by logic, by a logical analysis of the given political processes and phenomena. Let us consider this together.

Let us begin with what is most important. Did we fight for the division of Germany? No. This is not at all what we wanted. We wanted something else. We wanted Germany to cease being the source of the threat of war, of aggression.

The existence of two German states, the preservation of the rights of the victor-powers, and the general balance of forces in the world between East and West did, of course, remove the German threat as such. It was possible to pretend that the German question had been resolved. But it was impossible to ignore that the division of a single nation and the dissatisfaction with this situation in both parts of Germany were creating an alarming uncertainty at the very center of Europe.

The prevailing status quo could, obviously, have been maintained for a relatively long time. However, the people and history decided otherwise. The breaching of the Berlin Wall set off a chain reaction of changes which led to the unification of Germany less than one year later.

Now let us ask ourselves the following question: What specific changes of a military-strategic nature does the unification of Germany entail? The territory controlled by NATO will increase by approximately 100,000 square kilometers. The human potential of NATO will increase by 17 million persons. In a few years' time the last Soviet soldier will quit the territory of what used to be the GDR. And that is all. If we take into consideration that we are not living in 1941 but half-a-century later, that the emergence of nuclear weapons has fundamentally changed the notion of security, and that the changes which are taking place in no way disrupt or impair the general balance of forces, then any talk about deterioration of the USSR's military-strategic position loses all real substance.

Especially since the FRG will become an active participant in the future deep cuts in Armed Forces and armaments in Europe.

Especially since the FRG has renounced the possession of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons.

Especially since the FRG has signed all conceivable legal guarantees preventing the militarization of its foreign policy.

I foresee the following objections: Guarantees are merely words, documents, signatures. New generations of Germans, of German politicians will rise, and they will use different words and want to sign different documents. Theoretically, this is correct. History does not contain any absolutes, and that includes absolute guarantees. But it is important to understand that true guarantees are not words or letters, but real interests. For the present (and within the foreseeable historical future) no German interests require war. Germans do not need war. It will give them nothing, but may destroy everything (and this applies not only to the Germans). These are the real and reliable guarantees of peace in Europe. And if the development of Europe follows the Helsinki track—and so far it is difficult to imagine anything else—then the said guarantees will strengthen rather than weaken.

And another point: Could the Soviet Union have prevented the unification of Germany, could it have "not ceded" the GDR to West Germany? In abstract terms, it is impossible to deny that it probably could have done so. It could have done so, had it resorted to the use of military force to preserve the Berlin Wall and to build new walls wherever necessary. And then what? Even if it had been possible to prevent a third world war and a nuclear missile clash, we would have blown up detente and torn it into shreads, we would have again turned Washington from a partner into a foe, we would have resuscitated the worst kind of "cold war," and, undoubtedly, unleashed another spiral of the arms race. In my opinion, the game is not worth the candle.

But what matters is not only, or even primarily, this relatively primitive calculation. What matters is something else. In the second half of the eighties, we finally

managed—with much delay but managed it nonetheless—to perceive the world around us such as it is. We managed to cast off anodyne illusions and grasp that the people and peoples whom the Soviet Army had liberated from fascism do not accept the Stalinist and neo-Stalinist models of "regimented socialism", that they do not want to occupy the position of junior partners, and that they condemn our armed interference in their affairs.

Realizing this was the first step. The second step was bringing our policy in line with this realization, and granting the "fraternal" countries freedom of choice. And finally, the third step was accepting this choice even if it did not suit us. Within a very short time we traversed this path and, having won a victory over ourselves and our past, we brought our policy in line with the principles which we ourselves have proclaimed. This was the beginning of the healing of the division of Europe which was logically and politically completed with the unification of Germany.

Yes, we have lost. We have lost a world that we ourselves had created and that therefore suited us, where people obeyed us, and where we felt to be the most important and the smartest. The world which we acquired instead, in which we find ourselves, is more complex and contradictory. In it it is impossible to issue orders, it is necessary to negotiate. It is impossible to demand respect for yourself if you do not respect others.

Time will pass and the sense of loss and defeat, which stems from the fact that we are judging current events by yesterday's criteria, will become less painful and will disappear altogether. And that which we have gained—cooperation instead of enmity, disarmament instead of arms race, free circulation of ideas and people instead of visible and invisible walls—will become more obvious, significant, and tangible.

In conclusion, I will reiterate what I have said and written many times before. No one is threatening us. No one is getting ready to attack us. Both because "they" do not need war, and because we are sufficiently strong to be left in peace. Against this backdrop the new treaty with the new Germany is a major step forward in the creation of the new Europe. And consequently it is also a step forward in the consolidation of our international position and our security.

PRAVDA Reports Soviet-FRG News Conference

PM1311161990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Nov 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Broad Prospects for Collaboration; Joint Press Conference by M.S. Gorbachev and Helmut Kohl"]

[Text] Bonn, 10 Nov—As has already been reported, President M.S. Gorbachev and FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl held a joint news conference Friday. In his introductory remarks H. Kohl said:

[Kohl] This is the first visit by a foreign head of state to united Germany. This fact—and the fact that the Berlin wall crumbled precisely a year ago—makes our meeting politically symbolic. It is with your country—the Soviet Union—that united Germany is concluding its first fundamental foreign policy treaty. We have just signed a Treaty on Good-Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation. This was the leitmotiv of the talks we held today, and also in the summer in the Caucasus and at the beginning of the year in Moscow. I must thank you, Mr. President, for your decisive contribution to the fact that Germany, our fatherland, was able to unite on 3 October in conditions of peace and freedom and in harmony with all our neighbors.

Today we again spoke in detail about our future cooperation, primarily in the economic sphere. And we were united in the view that the economic reforms in the USSR, which are entering a new stage, will be supported by us in word and deed. We will do this on both a bilateral and a multilateral basis. We agreed that the federal government will send to the USSR at the latter's request a group of highly skilled specialists to support the economic reforms. I will personally seek to ensure that the decisions adopted by the European Council in Dublin and at the Houston summit on aiding the Soviet Union are implemented. In a few weeks, in mid-December, the European Council will meet in Rome, where we are going to discuss these intentions again.

I assured you, Mr. President, that the programs of exchanges adopted during my October 1988 visit to Moscow, particularly the programs for retraining leading economic cadres and youth exchanges, will be continued even at the end of the three-year period which we decided upon. In connection with the agreement on the withdrawal of Soviet troops we have outlined specific measures to ensure that the program to construct housing for the returning servicemen and their families is fulfilled swiftly, efficiently, and in a timely fashion.

We paid a particularly great deal of attention to the question of the position of Soviet Germans. The treaty we have just signed guarantees these people the right to retain and develop their language, culture, and traditions. We want to help them in this. And, so far as possible, to make life easier for them in their age-old homeland.

Among international issues, the development of events in the Persian Gulf naturally occupied a special place. We expressed serious concern at the fact that the Iraqi leadership is continuing to refuse to fulfill the international public's demand for the release of all foreign hostages and the complete withdrawal of its troops from Kuwait. The international solidarity against aggression and violence which has now been expressed in over 10 UN Security Council resolutions is a more than encouraging reaction to these events. We were united in the view that the Security Council, and primarily its permanent members, will continue and step up its efforts to safeguard international law.

Ladies and Gentlemen! Our meeting with President Gorbachev today was a continuation of this year's two previous meetings—in Moscow and the Caucasus. It was held in the same open and trustful atmosphere and—I particularly want to note—in a friendly atmosphere. And I would venture to say that we have done good work here in Bonn. That is the truth, that is important, and I want to emphasize that personal mutual trust has received new confirmation.

[Gorbachev] I share Mr. Chancellor's assessment regarding the uniqueness of the moment and I want to say that this topic was the central one in our present dialogue. We did not spend time on approaches, on probing positions. A great deal was clear to us beforehand. Recently we have been cooperating fruitfully and effectively and we were ready to find correct responses to the challenge of the time. But these challenges are huge and are accompanied by great changes not only in relations between our peoples but also in Europe and in the world.

At the treaty-signing and during the exchange of opinions we stressed: What is happening today is of tremendous importance to the destiny of the German nation, to the history of Soviet-German relations, and to Europe as a whole. We see a new role for our two great peoples and states in this rapidly changing world which contains both tremendous opportunities for the perestroyka of international relations in the spirit of the time, and also dangers. For any abrupt turnaround is not guaranteed against danger, and the chancellor and I paid much attention to this. This is why even before, without delaying, without waiting for the completion of the process of German unification, within the framework of the political discussions and exchange of opinions between the Soviet and FRG leaderships we deemed it necessary and possible to begin preparing fundamental legal acts that would regulate these relations and create a legal basis for them at the new stage in the development of Germany, the Soviet Union, and Europe.

So today, not only to the satisfaction, I hope, of Soviet people and Germans—now in a united Germany—but also to the satisfaction of Europeans and the entire world community, we were able to sign these very important documents. They open up a new page—not only in that they contain important political statements but also in that they set very alluring goals for the two peoples and states and contain mechanisms for achieving these goals. Therefore it is characteristic and good that, alongside the "grand" treaty, as the Treaty on Good-Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation is called here, a Treaty on Cooperation in the Spheres of Science, Technology, and Culture was simultaneously signed today. As you can see, it is now a matter of implementing the political aims of the "grand" treaty. And within its framework Chancellor Helmut Kohl and I were able to discuss problems of economic cooperation in a purely practical context.

The chancellor showed great interest in how perestroyka is going, where we are, and the nature of the peculiarities of the present stage. And I hope he received exhaustive answers in this regard. But if any questions remain, we have another day to come and I will try to answer them.

We discussed questions connected with the presence of a large grouping of Soviet troops on German territory for some time. In the name of our people and government I said that we greatly appreciate the position of Mr. Weiszaecker, the president, Chancellor Kohl, and Mr. Genscher, who have called on the German people to regard the Soviet servicemen who are here by virtue of certain decisions and treaties as representatives of a friendly army. Perhaps I am not conveying their words very accurately, but the meaning, the essence is precisely that. And our public greatly appreciates this.

We discussed what our economic links should be like in the immediate, medium-term, and long-term future. And we found it necessary to deepen practical work in all these spheres. I think that we have an understanding on the main issues at the upcoming European Community session in Rome. But we agreed to further clarify and study some questions.

I will not continue the list of what we discussed. I will merely add that, as Mr. Helmut Kohl has already said, we devoted considerable time to analyzing the situation in the Persian Gulf. I have already spoken about this repeatedly in recent days. I want to say once again that the understanding of Mr. Kohl and me is that the world community and the United Nations are essentially undergoing a trial. A new policy is being tested. We have abandoned "cold war" and its methods of solving international problems. We are seeking new approaches of a political kind in order to resolve both those problems which we have inherited and those that are arising and may arise during the new stage.

So we believe that we must act firmly and consistently, in the spirit of the decisions adopted by the UN Security Council. And let no one hope to drive a wedge between us, split us, and violate this unity. If we prove unable to act productively in the new peaceful period and to resolve the problems that arise, then this threatens very serious consequences. We must be united. That is the leitmotiv of the exchange of opinions, and I think the details are not all that important.

[Reporter] You primarily noted the political significance of the treaty you have signed. But what is the human dimension of this document for you personally and for the peoples of our two countries. who remember not only bright but also bitter pages of history?

[Kohl] The document is all-embracing, it regulates almost all spheres of our peoples' life. I remember our first conversations over a year ago at the Federal Chancellor's Department during the president's first visit, and also during our further meetings in his homeland, in the Caucasus. A very important point—if I may be permitted to reply for us both—is that we belong to the same very specific generation. We were both children—aged between nine and 11 years—when the war began. And I

very well remember, Mr. President, the meetings with the residents of the city where you headed the party committee for many years. I remember how honored war veterans greeted us and said: "You are right to be concerned to ensure that what we went through is not repeated for our grandchildren's generation." Those simple words from elderly people embody an entire program. And no juridical document, even if it is very cleverly drafted, is likely to be able to express more clearly what we are both striving for. So today—and we both felt this—was a great and good day for us. And I hope that goes for us all—for people in both the Soviet Union and Germany.

[Gorbachev] What I want to say about this question is the following. Everything we have done together with Mr. Helmut Kohl in recent years we have always done with a sense of responsibility, and we have always remembered the common history of our relations. We have remembered everything bright in this history, the traditions rooted deep in the centuries. But we have also never forgotten, and that goes for today's conversations, too, the grim period bound up with the war. The chancellor has already touched on this. Yes, in recent decades much has been done on both sides to ensure that we arrived at today and our present relations. And this attests to our peoples' greatness, to their wisdom, and to the tremendous reserves of humanism.

We cannot forget, however, what a high price our two peoples paid for this and what carnage fascism dragged them into. Today we must say that the unification process, still less today's treaties, would not have existed if the Germans themselves above all had not drawn conclusions for themselves from the lessons of the grim period of their history. If they had not embodied these conclusions in new forms of relations with other peoples. We welcome this and we pay tribute to the German people. And our people—I feel a filial pride in this—after bearing all the burdens of the war and sustaining the heaviest losses—and according to recent data, it is true, the figures are still being clarified—we lost about 26 million Soviet citizens—our people found within themselves the strength to restore their country. [sentence as published] To restore it to life and to offer the world new initiatives in order to move away from confrontation and "cold war" toward cooperation among all peoples.

We attach tremendous importance to relations between our peoples. The placing on record of new realities and everything enshrined in the documents we signed today is confirmation that both our peoples and governments, having traveled this whole path, are prepared to act in a spirit of cooperation, partnership, and good-neighborliness. We make no secret—we also spoke of this today—of our intentions of advancing toward very broad cooperation by strengthening trust and building an edifice of friendship between our peoples. That is a great goal. And I think that this path will bear wonderful fruits for our two countries, for Europe, and for the world.

[Reporter] Mr. Gorbachev, in your speech this evening, of which we already have the text, you say Germans and the Soviet Union are no longer military adversaries. Who then is your potential adversary; indeed, do you have any such potential adversaries?

[Gorbachev] We proceed from the premise that a unique opportunity has opened up today to build new international relations on the basis of disarmament, which has fortunately not stopped at the first stage and is entering the second. Work in Vienna is now practically being completed, not to say largely complete. I must add to this: talks on a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive arms are successfully under way and are also nearing completion. This shows the profound changes in the policy of the main protagonists in the world arena, including the military powers. And this policy, I hope, reflects fundamental changes that have taken place in the mood of the world community of peoples. I do not see any people of any country as adversaries whom we suspect of preparing war against us. That is our perception of today's world. On the basis of this analysis we adopted a defensive doctrine, followed by the perestroyka of the USSR Armed Forces. We are on the eve of reform of the Armed Forces, the draft of it has now been referred to the government and will then be referred to the Supreme Soviet. Comrade Army General Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff is here, he is nodding in confirmation of my information.

That is how we view the world today, and this enables us to hope that we have put forward a correct idea—moving toward a nuclear-free and nonviolent world as the greatest goal for the whole world community. We have plenty of other problems! Why exhaust ourselves with an arms race whose only effect has been to poison international relations? Now we must restore them. It adversely affected the development of such rich countries as the Soviet Union and the United States. That is my answer to your direct question.

[Reporter] Yesterday Mr. Shevardnadze, discussing the possibility of the use of force in the Persian Gulf, said that this cannot be ruled out and that a situation which will really require such a step may arise. I have two questions. First: In what situation will the Soviet Union agree to the use of force? And second: In what situation would you, Mr. Gorbachev, consider the question of sending Soviet troops to aid the forces that have now united against Iraq?

[Gorbachev] I think that everything we have done so far by acting together within the framework of the UN Security Council is a tremendous victory. This may seem strange to you, but I insist on this definition. After all, for the first time, maybe even the first time in history—and not just in postwar history—we are acting together in an acute situation, in a spirit of unity and understanding of our responsibility to the world community, within the framework of the United Nations, which was created for the purpose of defending and preserving peace. We condemned the aggressor, adopted resolute measures,

and are implementing them. And all attempts to shake this unity have failed. They are also doomed in the future. Finally, we are preserving a region which is a source of energy for the world economy. And this means that the world economy is functioning in the interests of the entire world community. All this, taken together, is an important victory for the United Nations.

Another point. I believe that the United Nations will use its instruments and will decide how it should act in the future. We will not get down to "planning" operations with you now. I think that the United Nations, cooperating and analyzing, will act consistently. And beyond any doubt, implementation of the Security Council decisions will be ensured.

[Reporter] Mikhail Sergeyevich, Mr. Kohl. The Soviet Union developed multifaceted relations with the GDR over the decades. Do you think that the treaty you signed today will ensure the preservation and further development of the USSR's links with the eastern part of united Germany? Is there any guarantee that the substantial capital accumulated here will not be lost?

[Gorbachev] I have the impression that the fears you mention are removed to a considerable extent by the treaties and documents we signed, and also by the understanding at the political level, at summit level. They indicate that we must come to terms with the realities and act in such a way that everything positive in the relations which existed hitherto serves as a good bridge for the development and expansion of relations with the whole of Germany. It cannot be said that everything will be preserved the way it was before. That cannot be the case. Changes are now taking place within the framework of a united Germany. Nevertheless, I must note the chancellor's assurances—this is reflected in the documents—that it is intended to promote in every possible way the preservation of the useful and diverse relations which existed between the USSR and the GDR. They must be used in the interests of developing relations with a united Germany. I am even intending to speak out on this topic in my dinner speech today. I hope the dinner is going to take place, Mr. Chancellor? (laughter)

[Kohl] For my part I want to say a few words—after all, this is a fundamental issue. I want to bluntly say: I believe that the Soviet Union's economic and trade position will actually improve as a result of German unification. I do not think that in the former conditions we could have achieved even an approximately similar level of economic relations. Why? The Soviet Union's economic relations with united Germany are relations with a country that is one of the most important members of the European Community. And the European Community—this can be clearly foreseen—will soon acquire a new and even greater economic dynamic. The very fact that 340 million people will unite in a single European market without borders by the end of 1992, in practically two years, shows this.

And by way of conclusion to the news conference I will say for my part quite definitely: We want the treaty we signed today, the "grand" treaty, and the other treaties not to exist only on paper. We want these treaties to be filled with life. I want to do everything possible for this, and I say this in the name of the government I head. This is a widespread opinion in the Federal Republic, one which goes far beyond the bounds of the present government's political positions. We want the policy of reforms in the Soviet Union associated with the name of Mikhail Gorbachev to succeed. We want it to be clear both today and in the future that this is a chance for peace in Europe, for equilibrium, and everything that serves the cause of peace in Europe goes far beyond the bounds of the European region. All this is considerably broader, because the world has become far more interdependent.

What President Gorbachev said in answer to the question about the Persian Gulf crisis would have been totally inconceivable even five years ago. This in itself shows how far we have come. Thank God. And so I believe that I can answer your question thus: So far as details are concerned, we will certainly have specific problems, because everything is changing. But I say again that the Federal Republic and the federal government intend to reach mutual understanding in these matters. Moreover, by intensifying relations in all spheres—the economic and general political spheres, in questions of cultural, scientific, and youth exchanges, and in practically all spheres of people's lives—we want to write a bright new chapter. This is why I said at the start that today is a good day.

Berlin Mayor Interviewed Prior to Moscow Visit

PM1311120390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Nov 90 First Edition p 5

[Interview with Walter Momper, mayor of Berlin, by correspondent S. Zyubanov in Berlin; date not given: "Bridge Between East and West"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] [Zyubanov] Mr. Momper, what hopes do you link with your visit to the capital of the Soviet Union?

[Momper] First I expect from this trip a continuation and consolidation of the partnership relations between Berlin and Moscow. Second, I believe that it will serve as a contribution to Soviet-German cooperation and friendship.

We want to sign a joint statement on cooperation with Moscow and then develop it on a new basis. Primarily we intend to expand cultural and youth exchange which, incidentally, had been taking place before between the public of our cities.

[Zyubanov] It is 15 years since you visited Moscow. What is the special feature of your present visit to the Soviet Union?

[Momper] It is my first official visit to the USSR. It is taking place in a situation where the postwar period is ending and we are turning a new page in European history. I hope that good cooperation will be set up between the Soviet Union and Germany. At the same time we must not forget the past. The Germans in particular must not forget how much grief the German attack in 1941 brought the peoples of the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, a painful period of division, blockade, and "cold war" between East and West has come to an end for the Germans. I think that the treaty on good-neighborliness, partnership, and cooperation between the FRG and the USSR is a good basis for developing relations between the German people and the peoples of the Soviet Union. Germany's unification and the treaties signed in this connection, in particular on the reduction of troops in Europe, give us a good chance of releasing forces and funds to help the peoples of East Europe and especially the Soviet Union in the perestroyka of the economy with a view to increasing its efficiency. This is a big task, and we are ready to promote its solution.

The Germans are grateful to everyone who has helped their reunification and we are especially grateful to the Soviet Union and to President Mikhail Gorbachev.

I want to take this opportunity to assure Soviet people that Germany wants to be a country which not only threatens no one but also lives in good neighborliness with other countries—in both East and West.

[Zyubanov] Does your idea that Berlin should become a unique bridge between East and West remain topical today, after Germany's reunification?

[Momper] It is today that it is more topical than ever before. After all many of our people used to speak of Europe but had in mind only its western part. But now a situation has arisen whereby Europe Europe no longer ends for us at the Elbe. We want the European community to be open to all but to have special, privileged relations with the peoples of the Soviet Union. Berlin could become a lively European crossroads, a place of cultural, political, and economic exchange between East and West.

[Zyubanov] What role could Berlin play in accelerating the Helsinki process and building the all-European home?

[Momper] I believe that it is precisely now that the "East-West" conflict has been overcome and that the disarmament process is in full swing in Europe that we must be more active in resolving questions of economic development for the benefit of all European countries and set up political cooperation with third world countries. All this could be done successfully within the framework of the Helsinki agreements. During my visit I intend to discuss with USSR Foreign Minister the question of creating in Berlin a secretariat and other organs of which the process for security and cooperation initiated in Helsinki is objectively needed. We will be glad if the Soviet Union supports this initiative.

[Zyubanov] In accordance with the accord which has been reached, the Soviet Western Group of Forces will remain in Germany until its complete withdrawal in 1994. What must be done for the Soviet Army, in the words of pastor Pekh [name as transliterated], leader of the German-Soviet Friendship Society, "to leave German soil with a sense of dignity and recognition of its historical services?" And another thing: How do you conceive of the fate of the numerous monuments and memorials to Soviet servicemen after the definitive withdrawal of the Western Group of Forces?

[Momper] First I shall speak of the monuments. The treaty on good-neighborliness, partnership, and cooperation between Germany and the USSR notes that all monuments and graves of Soviet soldiers will be preserved and reliable care ensured for them. There is no doubt of that. The war memorials should be preserved for history. They are needed as a reminder to our descendants of the hundreds and thousands of Soviet soldiers who died on German soil during World War II. This primarily applies, of course, to the famous monument to the Soviet soldier carrying a little German girl in Treptow park.

The Soviet troops' planned withdrawal—and I must emphasize this without fail—is not a defeat for one side or let us say a retroactive victory for the other. It is a clear step toward disarmament.

[Zyubanov] How do you assess the significance of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Bonn?

[Momper] I believe its significance simply cannot be overestimated inasmuch as this visit symbolizes the entry of the USSR and the FRG into a new phase of partnership and friendly relations. That applies primarily to the spheres of disarmament and the reduction of tension and also to the field of economic cooperation.

M.S. Gorbachev's visit also symbolizes the end of the period of tension between East and West and a turn toward new cooperation in Europe.

In conclusion I want to say that Gorbachev's great popularity in Germany and in Europe as a whole means at the same time a recognition of the Soviet people's gigantic efforts for the fundamental transformation of their country and the liberalization and democratization of their multinational society.

Berlin Mayors Visit To Establish Direct Ties

Arrive 11 Nov

LD1211000690 Berlin ADN International Service in German 2244 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—The two mayors of Berlin, Walter Momper and Tino Schwierzina, arrived in Moscow this evening for political talks. They are to hold

discussions with Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov and other politicians on future cooperation between the two capital cities.

Late this evening Momper and Schwierzina took up a private invitation from the poet Yevgeniy Yevtushenko to his apartment in Moscow. Present there were Leningrad Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak, who had traveled to Moscow specially for the meeting; Popov's first deputy, Sergey Stankevich; member of the Presidential Council Aleksandr Yakovlev; USSR Culture Minister Nikolay Gubenko; the well-known historian Yuriy Afanasyev; and other Soviet personalities.

Meet With Popov, Falin

LD1211214490 Moscow TASS in English 2047 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Yegorov]

[Text] Moscow November 12 TASS—Visiting West Berlin burgomaster Walter Momper today met Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov, Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Valentin Falin and visited a town-planning exhibition. In the afternoon, Momper addressed Moscow scientists and economists.

Berlin and Moscow have lots of links, Momper told the meeting. "Relations between our two cities and countries were bearing the burden of this century. I mean the years of struggle against German fascism, decades of cold war and military opposition between superpowers. Fortunately, this has all passed," he said.

President Mikhail Gorbachev has advanced the idea of a common European home, he said. The idea opened up prospects for doing away with a bloc thinking and confrontation. The German-Soviet treaty on partnership and cooperation will be a corner-stone here, he said.

Speaking about the development of business ties between the two countries, Momper said they are experiencing great difficulties.

"We are interested in rendering active assistance to the Soviet Union in its economic reforms, including financial aid. But the restructuring in the Soviet Union also needs consultative and cooperative assistance," he said.

"It is necessary to develop effective production by setting up joint ventures and share participation in capitals. Germany and particularly Berlin propose partnership in personnel training and rendering services in marketing, advertising, sales and holding fairs and congresses," Momper said.

"To this end, we are setting up the world trade centre and the East-West economic academy. We are planning to host new service and trade firms," Momper said. He said he believes Eastern Bloc countries might join the all-European market mainly via Berlin.

Sign Friendship Treaty

LD1211141290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Three signatures appeared together today under an agreement on friendship and cooperation between Moscow and Berlin. As it still only remains to elect the leaders of the two unified parts of the German city, the document was signed by the current mayor of West Berlin Momper and the mayor of the former capital of the GDR Schwierzina, who have come to Moscow, and also by the deputy chairman for the Moscow Soviet, Stankevich. Speaking immediately after the signing ceremony at a session of the Moscow Soviet, Momper noted that the agreement provides for the further development of cooperation and exchanges between Moscow and Berlin. This is one of the important steps along the road to a unified and indivisible Europe.

Meet With Kvitninskiy 13 Nov

LD1311163890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1038 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, 13 Nov (TASS)—USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Kvitninskiy today received Berlin mayors Walter Momper and Tino Schwierzina.

They discussed the prospects for cooperation between the relevant Soviet organisations and the Berlin laender in the light of the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the FRG and at the level of implementing the treaty on good-neighborliness, partnership, and cooperation between the two countries.

Hold Joint News Conference

LD1311140290 Berlin ADN International Service in German 1105 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—At a joint news conference in the Soviet capital today, Berlin and Moscow mayors Walter Momper, Tino Schwierzina, and Gavriil Popov, stated their desire for constructive cooperation. Walter Momper spoke of the "highly symbolic value" of the first visit by a governing mayor of the German capital and of a "climatic breakthrough".

The partnership between the two cities should now be developed "where it is in our power", he said. Momper spoke in favor of good relations to the Soviet troops in the Berlin region and for respect and protection for Soviet cemeteries and memorials. He also called for sister city arrangements, like that between Berlin and Moscow, to be taken up between other cities in the two countries. The relationship of trust must grow from below. Tino Schwierzina described it as necessary for a spirit of "meeting each other freely half-way" to prevail in relations between the two capitals and not the spirit of the past. Mayor Popov made the assessment that perestroyka has already brought significantly more results on German soil than in its own country. He wished Walter Momper success in the forthcoming elections.

Mayors Hail USSR-FRG Treaty

LD1211200190 Moscow TASS in English 1753 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 12 TASS—A Soviet Communist Party official today described the recently-signed Soviet-German treaty on good-neighbourly relations, partnership and cooperation as a "peace treaty".

Valentin Falin, secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee, was speaking at a meeting with West Berlin Burgomaster Walter Momper here.

Falin said the treaty "is more than just an agreement between two states seeking to revise and renew their relations. It differs from classical peace treaties, because it is oriented to the future, rather than to the past."

Momper said that a "new page is being opened in the history of the two countries, and Moscow and Berlin can make a substantial contribution to the development of cooperation in economy, culture and other spheres."

The burgomaster said that relations with the Soviet Union were largely considered from "purely economic positions" in Germany, disregarding political and cultural aspects.

"Berlin intends to make its contribution to the establishment of a new partnership with Moscow," Momper said. "It is culture that should promote better mutual understanding between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Germany."

TASS Previews 'Historic' Soviet-Italian Treaty

LD1311170790 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 13 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Italy will precede the Paris summit of the CSCE member-nations opening on November 19.

During the visit, the USSR and Italy are expected to sign a treaty of friendship and cooperation. The treaty will be signed for the Soviet Union by Mikhail Gorbachev and for Italy by Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti.

In Moscow, this treaty is being described as "historic". In Soviet diplomatic circles, they emphasise it is the first time that the USSR and Italy have stated that they regard each other as friendly states seeking accord. This way they close the door on the period of confrontation and suspicion in relations between the two countries, which were typical of the cold war era.

The treaty will contain provisions on military-political, economic, cultural and humanitarian cooperation. Everything positive that has already been achieved by the Soviet Union and Italy will be legally sealed in the treaty.

But the main meaning of the treaty is its projection into the future, because it lays a solid foundation for bilateral relations and paves the way to a fundamentally new type of interaction between the two European states. This interaction is distinguished by trust, mutual understanding and readiness to pool efforts to tackle common problems.

The treaty will be signed in the run-up to the Paris CSCE sumit. This is deeply symbolic, as together with similar treaties signed by the Soviet Union with France and West Germany, it should become one of the foundations of a common European home.

In view of this, in Soviet diplomatic circles they emphasise that Europe is entering a new era of its history, the era of awareness by the people living in it that all of them are one community of nations, in which the Soviet-Italian factor will take a worthy place.

CPSU's Dzasokhov Visits Madrid Socialist Congress

Meets Spanish Leaders

PM1311143190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Second Edition p 7

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent V. Volkov and TASS correspondent R. Serebrennikov: "Meetings in Madrid"]

[Text] Madrid, 10 Nov—Felipe Gonzalez, secretary general of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party [PSOE] and chairman of the government, received A.S. Dzasokhov, member of the CPSU Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, here today. He is here at the invitation of the PSOE leadership to take part in the work of the 32d PSOE Congress in Madrid.

A detailed conversation took place during which they examined questions of bilateral relations in the light of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's recent visit to Spain. Particular attention was devoted to the means of and approaches to ensuring the effective implementation of the accords secured, particularly in the sphere of bilateral relations, which are designed to considerably broaden trade and economic ties and cultural contacts.

Felipe Gonzalez stressed that the Spanish side is interested in practical actions to back perestroyka processes in the Soviet Union, regarding this not only as a Soviet national undertaking but also as a cause that is in the common interests of European peoples, including Spain. He expressed the hope that the Soviet side would create appropriate organizational preconditions for promoting the joint programs.

Mutual satisfaction was voiced at the positive processes taking place on the European continent. Felipe Gonzalez noted in this connection that the new political thinking is revealing broad scope for overcoming the barriers that took shape during the postwar period, particularly in conditions when Europe, like the whole world, is parting with the cold war period. It is important, he remarked, to

create a high degree of trust. That is the key and the precondition for resolving many issues.

The Soviet side provided information regarding the recent measures being implemented in the Soviet Union in the sphere of radical economic reform and the renewal of the multiethnic Soviet Union. The importance of developing cooperation in all areas between the two countries—state, political and interparliamentary cooperation—was stressed. In this context the importance of broadening CPSU-PSOE cooperation was noted. A PSOE delegation will visit the USSR in the near future at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee for an in-depth exchange of opinions on the entire range of issues of mutual interest.

On the same day, A.S. Dzasokhov, who is also chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, met Senate Speaker Juan Jose Laborda and Luis Fajardo, chairman of the Congress of Deputies Foreign Affairs Commission.

During an exchange of opinions they agreed that the two countries' parliaments will be able to play a greater role than hitherto in joint participation in the all-European process and also—particularly important—in the sphere of exchanging experience of Soviet and Spanish legislative organs' work, particularly since there are very many similar questions.

On behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet A.S. Dzasokhov conveyed an invitation to the Cortes Generales to send a parliamentary delegation to visit the USSR headed by Senate Speaker Juan Jose Laborda.

Comments on Similarities

LD1211214590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Nov 90]

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The 32d Congress of the governing Spanish Socialist Workers Party [PSOE] has ended its work in Madrid. Among the guests of the forum was a CPSU delegation led by comrade Dzasokhov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] In his report to the congress, Felipe Gonzalez stated that there are very many common viewpoints about the more important problems of the present-day between our parties. How do you view this?

[Dzasokhov] We discovered much that was similar in our views. This relates to ideas which the Spanish political and state leadership have on European processes; they have something fundamentally in common with our ideas. Felipe Gonzalez said plainly that he does not imagine a united Europe without the direct involvement of a Europe conceived as being from the Atlantic to the Urals.

There are other issues too. I believe we can learn something from each other. The Spanish experience is interesting.

[Correspondent] Well, concerning the Spanish experience, here there was, after all, the so-called transition period. Well, to a certain extent, and given all the difference between our countries, something similar is happening in our country. So what draws your attention, what, from your viewpoint, might we take, in terms of positive experience, say?

[Dzasokhov] At the congress, in the documents that were distributed, and in the debates a great deal of attention was devoted to confirming market relations which were recently introduced here in full measure. Delegates spoke in particular and recalled the difficulties which accompanied them in 1983 and 1984. Now, Spain has made fundamental progress in the economic sphere, and at the same time, inasmuch as we are at the Socialist Party Congress, the call to defend the socialist idea was heard in a very weighty and authoritative way.

As he spoke, Felipe Gonzalez polemicized not only with congress delegates but, it seems to me, he was even polemicizing with the world community, maybe even with many of our compatriots, saying that the socialist idea has not lost its significance and its attraction. What is at issue is simply that everywhere people are parting with the distortions which were part of the socialist model which is departing from the political sphere. [end recording]

There was a meeting between the Soviet delegation and PSOE Secretary General Felipe Gonzalez. The delegations exchanged views on specific measures to implement the accords achieved during the visit to Spain by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and also discussed issues of activating state, parliamentary and other relations between the USSR and Spain.

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Reconvenes 14 Nov; Agenda Reviewed

LD1411090790 Moscow TASS in English 0800 GMT 14 Nov 90

[By TASS legislative commentator Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS—Returning to work today after a 12-day recess, the Soviet parliament would do well to remember that time is literally money in this case: Every day of delaying crucial decisions spells tangible, including financial, losses for the nation.

The financial cost loomed large during the deputies' obvious foot-dragging in choosing an economic reform plan, and the same is true now as preparations for a new union treaty are top priority.

It should furnish a fundamentally new legal basis under the Soviet federation, create a new power structure, delimit the powers of the centre and republics, and thereby defuse increasing tension between them.

Although the final say on the Union treaty lies with the supreme soviets of constituent republics, the opinion of the federal legislature will also carry much weight, at least in moral terms.

The parliament must accomplish a great deal in the month remaining before the next Congress of People's Deputies. The parliamentary agenda is expected to be topped by debates on plan and budget estimates for 1991 (although it is not quite clear how these can be adopted before the Union treaty) and on several other bills.

Standing out among the latter is the long-awaited exit and entry law, which has caused such a stir both inside and outside this country.

Its enactment will effectively remove the problem of human rights in the USSR from the order of the day and give the U.S. Congress a legal reason to end trade discrimination against the Soviet Union.

Many Soviet newspapers see a direct connection between the early resolution of domestic economic woes and the number of Soviet citizens taking advantage of easy emigration procedures under the new law.

Although radicals clearly overdo it when they lash out at the federal parliament as a body that "has outlived itself." The Supreme Soviet definitely must work hard to improve its efficiency.

Otherwise, the deputies may be reminded that time is working against them.

Political & Social

Gerasimov Replaced as Foreign Ministry Spokesman

LD1311152690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1500 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishachev and Oleg Polyakovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 13 Nov (TASS)—Briefing on current issues of international life at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center will from now on be conducted by Vitaliy Churkin. It became known to TASS today from reliable sources at the Foreign Ministry that he has been appointed head of the Information Directorate of the Soviet Foreign Policy Department and thus the official spokesman of the Foreign Ministry.

The now ex-adviser at the USSR Foreign Ministry replaced Gennadiy Gerasimov who, according to information from the same sources, will be the Soviet ambassador in a European country.

By the universal acknowledgement of international journalists accredited in Moscow, Gennadiy Gerasimov enjoyed prestige and respect as the official government spokesman. To a significant degree he helped to raise the effectiveness of the USSR Foreign Ministry press service.

However, those journalists who know the new Foreign Ministry spokesman feel that Vitaliy Churkin will be a worthy replacement. He is one of the more capable and up-and-coming Soviet diplomats of the new mold who have appeared under Eduard Shevardnadze. This is borne out by the fact that of late he was a close aide of the USSR foreign minister.

Spokesman Comments on Yeltsin-Gorbachev Meeting

LD1311154590 Moscow TASS in English 1449 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich and Oleg Polovko]

[Text] Moscow November 13 TASS—The meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev and Russian President Boris Yeltsin on Sunday lasted about five hours and was "businesslike and constructive," presidential spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko told a briefing here today.

"This was a constructive and businesslike meeting between major politicians, who bear huge responsibility before the republic and the country," he said.

"They discussed a new Union treaty, economic issues and interaction between the Union and republican governments from the positions of this responsibility."

Commenting on today's statement by Yeltsin that Gorbachev "did not oppose in principle" the Russian parliament's proposing its own candidates for the posts of prime minister, defence minister and finance minister in a possible Soviet coalition government, Ignatenko said

that "this does not attest to the Soviet president's consent to the resignation of the Union government".

The spokesman said the Gorbachev-Yeltsin talks should be regarded as a "working meeting, rather than a sensational event."

Hijacker Held After Hijack Attempt Foiled

LD1311141390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1342 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Palchevskiy]

[Text] Minsk, 13 Nov (TASS)—Militiamen at Minsk-2 airport, near the Belorussian capital, foiled an attempt to hijack a TU-154 passenger airliner on Monday evening. Twenty minutes after take-off the stewardess handed a note from one of the passengers to the captain of the aircraft, which was flying the Leningrad-Lvov route on the evening of 12 November. The note contained a demand to change course and fly to Stockholm. If not, the hijacker threatened to blow up the airliner.

Assessing the situation, the crew changed course, having persuaded the criminal to make a stopover landing.

People were already waiting for the aircraft at the airport that evening. The rest, as they say, was merely a technical matter....

The operation was carried out quickly and without complications. The hijacker, who turned out to be an inhabitant of Naberezhnyye Chelny, born in 1972, a cooperative worker by profession, will have to stay in detention until his trial in Minsk.

Attempt to Import Pistols, Tear Gas Fails

PM1311112990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Oleg Stefashin under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Consignment of Weapons Seized"]

[Text] Karaganda—A consignment of weapons intended for sale was seized at Karaganda's "Tsentralnyy" airport during a joint operation by KGB and militia personnel.

Six West German-made pistols and 28 containers of CS gas were discovered in the luggage of a Karaganda resident arriving from Lvov. He admitted that he had acquired them for sale to certain circles specializing in extortion and also to prostitutes. The demand for the gas cylinders is particularly high among local prostitutes. They pay 500-600 rubles per cylinder. The demand for gas guns is even greater.

As I was told at the KGB's directorate in Karaganda Oblast, the trail from this batch of much sought-after goods seems to lead to a large and quite ramified organization involved in underground arms trafficking. Criminal proceedings have been instituted. Lvov KGB agents and militia personnel have joined in the investigation.

MVD Aide Reviews Progress in Weapons Seizures

PM1311120190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 90 p 3

[Unattributed reply to reader's query: "Do Not Keep Arsenals at Home"]

[Text] [Reader R. Fomin from Kirov] I am interested in knowing how many weapons are held in private hands at the present time.

[Unattributed reply] We write quite a lot about this subject in general. We even buy grenade throwers... (see KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, operation "Hand Over Weapons!") It is said that the "market prices" for weapons have fallen somewhat.

At a recent USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs briefing it was announced that at present there are 3,600,000 individual firearms "in circulation." Of these, 25,000 are rifles. A further 11,993 weapons are missing and being sought.

According to the latest information, in the four months that the USSR presidential decree forbidding the setting up of armed formations not provided for by USSR legislation and stipulating confiscation of weapons by organs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs in cases of their illegal possession has been in effect, 20,200 firearms, three tonnes of explosives, and 7,000 rounds of ammunition have been returned to arsenals.

Militia Major General Eduard Kalachev, chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Main Administration for Safeguarding Public Order, has stated that 132,000 arms storage facilities have already been inspected. Of these, 34,000 have been closed until breaches in security are eliminated. About 1.5 million weapons have been seized from schools, shooting ranges, and organizations of the Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy, and transferred to Soviet Army storehouses.

The deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Main Criminal Investigation Administration has announced that criminal proceedings have already been instituted in 364 cases of theft and illegal possession of arms. Thirty-nine people have been arrested.

Incidentally, more than 5,000 crimes have been perpetrated with the use of arms. This is four percent more than last year. Cases of premeditated murder are up 20 percent, cases of aggravated assault are up 15 percent, and there have been three times more violent robberies than in the same period last year.

Moscow TV Clarifies 'Inaccuracy' in Kryuchkov Item

LD1311214790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 13 Nov 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] On 12 November, in our program, in the item about the meeting between Comrade Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR's KGB, and the editorial board of the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper [see referent item published in the 13 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT on page 45 under the headline "Kryuchkov Answers Journalists Questions"], an inaccuracy was permitted on the question of the depoliticization of the state security bodies. In reality, the chairman of the committee expressed a negative attitude to the depoliticization of the bodies, referring to Article 16 of the law on public associations, which regulates this question.

Further on Kryuchkov Talks

PM1311111190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Lubyanka"]

[Text] The KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA editorial collegium visited the USSR KGB yesterday. Committee Chairman V.A. Kryuchkov had invited the journalists to call on him.

Let us cite some of the answers to questions asked by the journalists. The committee today remains a structure which retains its stability: Only about 600 people have resigned from it in the last few years. Just "a handful" have resigned from the Communist Party. The 218,000 border guards find it increasingly difficult to cope with the task of protecting the borders: The situation has become more complex in several regions....

"Kalugin was stripped of his titles according to the same regulations under which they were awarded to him," V.A. Kryuchkov said in response to a question whether a sitting of the USSR Council of Ministers had been convened in order to "demote" the general.

Democratic Platform To Set Up New Political Party

LD1311162490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1545 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Ruben Shirinyan]

[Text] Moscow, 13 Nov (TASS)—The Democratic Platform group that left the CPSU after its 28th congress intends to set up a new political party. Its constituent congress opens on Saturday in Moscow. This was reported at a news conference here today by representatives of the Democratic Platform.

The plan during the two working days of the congress is to examine and adopt the statute and program of the party and to elect the leadership.

One of the members of the committee for setting up the new organization, Vladimir Lysenko, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] people's deputy, said that in his view the new party will be "left of center." Evidently it will be given the name Republican Party of Russia.

The speakers at the news conference were unable to name the party's chief slogans. Its main efforts, it was noted, will be aimed at improving the life of every member of society.

Political parties of the "Democratic Russia" movement and leaders of the RSFSR legislature and government and of the Moscow Soviet have been invited to the constituent congress.

Yeltsin's, Popov's 7 Nov Sincerity Questioned

PM1311113190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Article by Vyacheslav Lukashevich under the rubric "Seven Days": "Is Old Square Far from the Mausoleum?"]

[Excerpts] What a strange question!—the reader will say, and he will be right. For Old Square is a stone's throw from Red Square. No more than five minutes' walk away.

Of course, Old Square, which symbolizes the CPSU Central Committee, since the headquarters of the Communist Party is situated right there, is alongside the Kremlin. But on 7 November, the day the 73d anniversary of the 20th century's greatest revolution—whatever people might say—was being celebrated, this square became a symbol of... anticommunism. There the Moscow Voters Association, "Democratic Russia's" Organizing Committee, the Social Democratic Party, Constitutional Democrats, and a number of other sociopolitical groups and movements gathered together opponents of the socialist choice and the line which the Communist Party is pursuing. And in this sense Old Square proved to be too far from the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and from the people's masses who were marching through Red Square in festive columns. The distance between them can probably be measured in terms of all the 73 years since October 1917 or, at least, the five years of pluralism.

It would have been possible not to discuss all this at the end of a festive week, for alternative rallies and demonstrations took place in many of the country's cities, which readers already know about, if it had not been for one circumstance of a moral rather than a political nature.

Central Television cameramen, showing the country the military parade and the Muscovites' demonstration, concentrated our attention on the Mausoleum rostrum. This time there were not many people on it. The USSR president, the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman, the premier, the chairmen of the parliamentary chambers, the leaders of Russia and Moscow, and, standing apart on the right wing, military chiefs. And we all saw G.Kh. Popov, chairman of the Moscow City Soviet, who was one of the initiators of the October festival's abolition and who left the Communist Party this summer, and

B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, who also suspended his party membership this summer, smiling and continually raising his fist to greet the demonstrators. God forbid that I should wish to reprimand them for this. But then the nonparty leaders came down from the Mausoleum rostrum and headed up a demonstration organized by Moscow's Communists and laid flowers at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum together with the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the Moscow CPSU City Committee first secretary. A normal and logical act of honoring the first leader of the Soviet state. And I am sure that millions of television viewers were pleased at such concord among the present leaders.

But the last Muscovites had not had time to pass through modestly decorated Red Square and the scarlet color of the unexpectedly numerous flags and banners had not had time to fade in the eyes of those standing on the Mausoleum rostrum before Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin and Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov had a change of "scene" and turned up on the rostrum in another square. Greeted by shouts of approval, they were now expressing support for the sentiments of the assembled "alternative" supporters, as though nothing had happened. And these sentiments, imprinted on placards, really were alternative. Whereas in Red Square we saw "We are for October," "We will defend Lenin's name and cause," and "We believe in the Communist Party," in Old Square there was "No to October 1917," "Down with the cult of Lenin," "The CPSU is a 20th-century plague..."

And yet it would be interesting to know: In which square were USSR People's Deputies Yeltsin and Popov being sincere? What were they thinking of when they "respectfully" bowed their gray heads while laying flowers at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and then stood on a different rostrum? [passage omitted]

So, one more year of October has passed into history. Now that the parade columns have passed along Gediminas Avenue in Vilnius, the flower beds which it had been proposed to use to "block" the parade's path have been restored to their places. Passions have subsided in Kiev's Kreshchatik. The Old Square alternative supporters have furled their banners and put them by for the next rally. Whatever bile flows from them, I believe that today they can poison only the slow-witted. They are like the "unaimed" shots which a certain A. Shmonov, a former fitter at the Izhorskiy Plant, fired outside the State Department Store. True, the air was still shaken. And, when you set out from Red Square for Old Square, covering the distance between them of five minutes or five years, you must still remember those shots.

Ligachev Linked to Cover-Up of Mass Grave

91UN0241A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 45, 7 Nov 90 p 11

[Article by Vladimir Zapetskiy: "Once Again: 'Yegor, You Are Wrong'?—Tragedy in Kolpashevskiy Yar; The Procurator Starts Legal Proceedings"—first two paragraphs appear in a box in the middle of the item]

[Text] During the stagnation years I lived and worked in Siberia—an austere but truly wonderful land. I am often asked what I was doing then and I answer with pride: "I was building socialism." (Ye. Ligachev, from a speech at the 19th party conference.)

It is very hard for me to name someone responsible for this. (Ye. Ligachev, from a speech at the meeting at Tomsk University.)

Let us remind our readers what Kolpashevo and Kolpashevskiy Yar are [1]

From a letter by Nikolay Klyuyev to Sergey Klychkov, June 1934.

"The village of Kolpashev is just a muddy knoll, peppered with log huts blackened by trouble and bad weather and packed with exiles. There is nothing to eat, food is either absent in the stores or ridiculously expensive. I have nothing to live on and there is no one to beg for anything as all of us are scouring around in search of some grub in the same way.... Think of me at this hour, think of miserable me, the homeless old poet whose appearance makes even the 'specially resettled' who are used to hellish images of human suffering shudder. I would say just one thing: 'I would rather be the most wretched creature alive than an exile in Kolpashevo!' The sky covered in ragged clouds, slanting rains rushing at you from the 1,000-mile-long swamps, the unceasing wind—all this is known as summer, which is followed by a ferocious, minus 50-degree winter...."

In those first days of his exile Klyuyev also wrote to N.F. Khristoforova-Sadomskaya describing, with characteristic anguish, the place where his destiny had taken him: "Eighty percent of the population are exiles. They are Chinese, Sarts, exotic Caucasians, Ukrainians, city hoodlums, former military officers, students, and nonentities from different parts of our country. They are all alien to each other and, more often than not, simply bellicose; each of them is looking for grub that does not exist, because Kolpashev became a gnawed bone a long time ago. I keep thinking: This is the famous Narym!"

* * *

Just before the May Day holidays in 1979 the edge of the river bank crumbled once again. It happened almost in the very center of the city, a few dozen meters away from the point where Lenin Street ends as it runs into the Ob. But this time the incident turned out to be far from ordinary.

From a river boat one could see a terrifying picture. Human remains—arms, legs, heads—were sticking out from the bared slope, starting at a depth of about two meters.

Boys were the first to find the burial place. They threw skulls into the Ob or ran around the city with skulls perched on top of sticks.

Then the adults became alarmed. People rushed to the river in crowds. Some old women believers would only go to the river bank with icons in their hands. The militia showed up there some two hours later.

Events then took the following course. The city authorities recovered from the initial shock. Within the next 24 hours construction battalion soldiers fenced the pit in; volunteer guards were sent there to help and were posted around the grave and its vicinity. A militia detail guarded the place through the night also.

Inside the fence they started to eliminate the grave.

"Officials hurried to explain that the pit contained the bodies of deserters shot during the war (hundreds of corpses, including women and children). They are diligently putting a high fence around the grave and, to avoid unnecessary work, a river tugboat is washing away part of the nasty river bank and dumping the human remains into the Ob." (From a statement by the "Memorial" society of Novosibirsk and Tomsk.)

* * *

Most of the Kolpashevo residents did not even suspect the presence of the grave until May 1979. But in spite of that nobody questioned its origin because this very spot, a former wasteland, was the site where an NKVD [People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs] base was built.

Its central building had two floors and was made of logs. Its side faced Dzerzhinskiy Street, and the building itself connected the ends of a U-shaped fencing which stretched some 150-200 meters along Dzerzhinskiy Street. During a certain period of time three watch towers could be seen above the fence. Two of them were positioned in the corners of the inner courtyard, the third was put near the central building, next to the gates that opened onto Dzerzhinskiy Street. The gates were always locked, and it was a rare occurrence that someone would enter the building itself through the front door during the daytime. That was the way old Kolpashevo residents remembered the NKVD building—gloomy and silent.

It is hard to say what was happening inside. In the course of later reorganizations the appearance of the inner courtyard changed too. Since the late fifties anyone could walk inside, as the gates stood wide open. But the courtyard was empty by then.

But before that time there had been an inside prison there; it was an ordinary, "dovetail" log house with a wood roof. The windows had "Yezhov visors" (the bottom half of the window was boarded up, and boards were also put over the top half but they were slanted so as to let some light in from above). According to some people, one wall of the prison faced Dzerzhinskiy Street, but other people insist that the entire prison was behind the fence and there was one more fence across the inner yard so that the prison was completely enclosed....

True Confession of Former Party Official P.E. Kostarev and Others

"In September 1965, Tomsk Oblast KGB Chief M. and a comrade 'from the center' flew to Kolpashevo. They came to my office (at that time I was first secretary of the CPSU Gorkom [city party committee] in Kolpashevo). The comrade from Moscow handed me an envelope and said: 'Open and read it in our presence.' The letter said that many so-called 'enemies of the people' were shot here in 1937 and their bodies were buried near the building of the NKVD/OGPU [United State Political Administration]. But the river had washed away so much of the river bank that the bodies might become uncovered and people would be able to recognize their relatives from their clothing. A lot of trouble might come up.

"This was followed by a request to provide cooperation in concealing the material evidence and all traces of the crimes. I knew we had to do it to avoid traumatizing those who had suffered from the repressions. I organized the necessary work; we found the location of the grave and identified its size. I had asked for a drilling rig to be sent to us from a geophysical expedition and they used it to drill some holes on the site. They put several kilos of quicklime into each and then pumped water into them using a hose from a fire water tank.

"A violent reaction started spewing clouds of white and yellow smoke that alarmed local residents. They thought there was a fire. We had to tell them that it was fire practice. We did all the work at night, in secret. It was all done by construction battalion soldiers. A month later they were demobilized, many of them before their term was over, so that they could not tell the Kolpashevo people about the operation. In this way the material evidence of Stalin's repressions was destroyed...."[2]

It might be useful to remind you here that Ligachev became first secretary of the party obkom [oblast party committee] in November 1965.[3] Could he possibly not have known about the Kolpashevo grave?

Kostarev also said that a year later, when he was already in the party obkom, they poured concrete over the graves of the Bolshevik regime victims in Tomsk. Kostarev admitted that it was none other than Ligachev who asked him to "deal right there on the spot" with this other burial place because "he had already had such an experience." (!) Ligachev mentioned this occasion in passing at the meeting at Tomsk University. He also said that the grave was discovered "rather accidentally when they were starting some construction work there."

A Strange Trip to Western Siberia

In early December 1989, E. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, went on a strange trip to western Siberia. It was strange because it took place just before the Second Congress of People's Deputies, when one would think that Yegor Kuzmich had enough precongress, behind-the-scenes worries in Moscow.

One has to be incredibly naive to think that Comrade Ligachev had no idea of the rallies in Tomsk and Novosibirsk as he was going there, or of the leaflets and information bulletins being distributed in these cities. Maybe they provided the real reason for his trip.

One question was asked at the meeting at Tomsk University which was "omitted" by all the mass media: "Who is personally responsible for the 1979 desecration and destruction of the grave of the victims of Stalin's repressions in the city of Kolpashevo on the Ob?"

This was Yegor Kuzmich's response to the question:

"It is very hard for me to name someone responsible for this. First, it happened quite unexpectedly. It was a real natural calamity in the full meaning of the word. You live here, on this land, and you know what spring flooding can do. And I will tell you quite openly, as we have gathered here for this purpose, that I learned that the bodies were those of victims of Stalin's repressions only after this occasion. We had not known the location of a single grave. After this we found one more burial place, this time in the center of the city. That happened rather accidentally too, as they were beginning some construction work there. There might be other graves somewhere, I just do not know. It was assumed that the people buried in Kolpashevo were the White Guard; there were also innocent people that had been shot under Stalin. All this developed with such great speed, so fast, that it was simply impossible to help with anything. I think you did the right thing by installing memorial plaques here, to show your respect for these people. I think there will be a real monument here one day. I express my full support for this trend and for the work of your organizations in this direction. We could not have reburied anyone there. There was nothing left there."

And that was all. Some people in the audience shouted demands that the guilty parties be named, but Comrade Ligachev pretended not to hear.

* * *

In August 1979, i.e. several months after the mass grave on the banks of Ob was destroyed, V.N. Shutov, then first secretary of the Kolpashevo Party Gorkom, in the presence of five witnesses claimed that everything had been done on the personal orders of Comrade Ligachev, obkom first secretary.

The materials collected by the Tomsk "Memorial" society serve as evidence, circumstantial at best, proving Comrade Ligachev's involvement in the desecration of the Kolpashevo grave. Most of them appeared in two issues of the hand-written magazine LETOPIS TERRORA [Chronicles of Terror] published by the Tomsk branch of "Memorial."

A number of organizations were used for the destruction of the grave. There were river transport workers, construction battalion soldiers, militiamen, geophysicists, even students from Special Vocational Training School 29. All this could hardly have happened without the orders of the party obkom. Besides, we also know that Bortnikov, an obkom secretary, was in charge of the operations.

The members of the Tomsk "Memorial" society found Cherepanov, captain of the OT-2010 tug-boat that was used for washing away the grave. We have to do justice to his courage and decency: He honestly described his participation in this unsavory event.

After the work was completed, the Tomsk KGB bestowed upon him a present—a "Tom" transistor radio. Some people received the "Alpinist" radios, watches, women were given a whole 20 rubles each and told: "our joint is not rich." Cherepanov also received an official letter of gratitude on behalf of... Comrade Andropov.

* * *

There is something like a ravine in place of the former grave now, a triangular scar cutting into the river bank. But instead of water there is river sand below it. Small river boats moor in this convenient little bay, some rowboats are lying on the sand. The slope makes it easy to climb up. One is reminded of the grave only by the pieces of board walls sticking out of the ground. According to some stories these were the walls of underground passages that used to connect the main NKVD building with the burial pits.

The ravine is some 25 meters wide, and cuts into the bank for some 10 meters. But all this would not even make one third of what you could see in May 1979. The Ob continues to wash away the bank. In six or seven years there will be waves splashing here....

I do not consider myself superstitious, but when I think of the Kolpashevo grave some vague fear envelops my heart. There is something transcending the reaches of human reasoning in this phenomenon: This ground, nature itself, refused to accept the human remains, it did not incorporate them, it did not allow grass and trees grow on them. But it preserved them without decay and, as if testing our conscience, it uncovered them to us: "Look at what you are doing, beasts!"

Then you start thinking that these people, whose lives were taken away in the name of our miserable well-being and who lost their right to a gravestone and to a place in our memory after they stopped living, did not go away. It is not that they were killed. They were not allowed to live. They were removed from nature's eternal cycle. They were thrown out of it, and those who did this tried to forget them and did their utmost not to remember.

They say that some of this monstrous sand mausoleum was not washed away then. They say there is one more pit left. They found it when they were drilling holes and it was filled either with an acid or with some alkali. Rumors, rumors, and again rumors.... What if they are true? What if they did not fill the holes?

Will corpses float down the Ob again?

From the editor

We learned that the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Procuracy did not ignore everything that had happened. We contacted L.A. Bagrayeva, prosecutor of the RSFSR Procuracy Investigation Administration, and she told us that the Procuracy began legal proceedings aimed at disclosing all the circumstances of grave destruction in the city of Kolpashevo, Tomsk Oblast. To ensure objectivity, the investigation was handed over to the Novosibirsk Oblast Procuracy.

Footnotes

1. Readers could have learned about the mass grave in Kolpashevo from various articles—in the Novosibirsk newspaper MOLODOST SIBIRI, for instance, in the Baltic newspaper SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH, in ZHELEZNODOROZHNIK KUZBASSA, etc.

2. Published in the Tomsk newspaper MOLODOY LENINETS on 22 June 1990.

3. And remained in this post through 1983.

Radio, TV Chairman on 'Democratized' Programming

LD1311144190 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Text] The process of democratization going on in Soviet society has democratized the work of television and radio, said the Chairman of the State Committee on Television and Radio Mikhail Nenashev at today's news conference.

A new structure is replacing the rigid centralization that existed for decades. Under it the four Soviet television channels will have full creative and commercial independence. The first channel, for one, will present official information and entertainment programs. The fourth, the (?21st Century) channel will emerge on the basis of educative programs. Its goal will to be prepare the younger generation for life in the third millenium.

Mikhail Nenashev has conceded that so far the requirements of TV viewers in entertainment programs are not satisfied in full. A way out of this difficulty lies in creating our own television sequels and concerts and expanding cooperation with foreign partners.

Economic

Consumer Protection Regulations To Be Enacted

PM0911130990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by L. Ivchenko under the "Events, Facts, Opinions" rubric: "I Am Returning... the Goods to You"]

[Text] The USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee has deemed trade rights concerning the exchange of substandard goods as contradictory to our rights enshrined in the USSR Constitution, and the Union Prosecutor's Office has sent a protest to K. Terekh, the USSR trade minister, about these departmental acts.

In this way regulations that discriminate against the buyer—in accordance with which he first had to chase around the workshops mentioned in the guarantee with his unsuccessful purchase and only after several attempts to repair the faulty object (or refusals to do so) could he obtain the right to return it to the manufacturer—have been suspended and will subsequently be repealed.

It now looks as though this action has come rather too late—there are no goods in the stores and there is nothing to exchange them for. But it could not have been accomplished at any other time—there was no such thing as a Constitutional Oversight Committee before. It turns out that it was beyond the powers of the Prosecutor's Office to have the absurd provisions repealed without this kind of support. It cannot be said that nothing was being done in this respect: Back in 1986 the then General Prosecutor A. Rekunkov wrote to the USSR Council of Ministers that the existing trade regulations contradict Article 41 of the fundamentals of USSR civil legislation and place the buyer and the seller on an unequal footing. A draft of new regulations governing exchange was even drawn up with the participation of legal organs—dealing in particular with domestic radioelectronic equipment—which did not even see the light of day: It was torpedoed by the former Ministry of the Communications Equipment Industry. B. Kravtsov, USSR minister of justice (at that time), drew the government's attention to this in his letter.

Alas, the citizens got nothing worthwhile out of this either, although departments, law-enforcement organs, and newspaper editorial offices were snowed under with complaints about the quality of goods.... "All engines are described in terms of horsepower," one letter said, as I recall, "but my moped is like an old nag. This morning it took me to work, but I had to come home on foot."

Incidentally, the losses caused by defective goods in the country's industry total 1-1.2 billion rubles a year. In 1988 (when there was still something to buy in the stores) the number of television sets that were the cause of complaints or repairs under guarantee amounted to around 2 million! The fact that every fourth television, every fifth tape recorder, and every 16th refrigerator had to be repaired during the guarantee period testified to the quality of our domestic technology. And that is what is behind all the customers' troubles....

"Under the guise of state interests, departments that had a monopoly on a product and produced defective goods were in fact protecting themselves against economic sanctions," said V. Artsukevich, deputy chief of the USSR Prosecutor's Office Administration for Supervision of the Observance of Legality and the Protection of Citizens' Rights in the Social Sphere. "And this impunity only exacerbated a situation in which output was

sometimes manufactured to such a standard that it could scarcely be let past the factory gates. And the burden of the disorders in production—with its shortage of spare parts, the poor quality of subassemblies, and so on—were placed on the shoulders of the buyer, although the law stipulated the equality of the buyer and seller in civil relations. We believe that the measure that has now been adopted by the Constitutional Oversight Committee and the Union Prosecutor's Office will seriously affect the producers by forcing them to make their brands more reliable. And when the happy time finally comes when there are plenty of goods—and we are all hoping for this with the approach to market relations—the new regulations will start working at full capacity. After all, the real controller will not be the technical control department or State Acceptance but the customer, who, in accordance with Article 41 of the fundamentals of USSR civil legislation, has the right to demand a replacement, an appropriate reduction in the price depending on the defects, the repair of the item free of charge, or a refund."

The USSR Ministry of Trade is now faced with the task of examining the Prosecutor's Office protest and bringing its trade regulations into line with this article.

Thus, the protracted fight lasting many years has evidently come to an end. Now all we have to worry about is the small problem of the goods....

Gosbank Policy Said To Undermine Gorbachev Decree

PM1411092790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Article by I. Zhagel: "'Scheme-96' Which Enhanced a USSR Presidential Decree"]

[Text] Can a civil servant revoke a decree by the country's president? Do not all rush to say no. He does not have the power to revoke one, but he can give it a "creative interpretation"....

For example, quite recently a letter of instruction signed by A. Voylukov, deputy chairman of the USSR Gosbank [State Bank], was sent to the commercial and cooperative banks which, as it said, introduced the so-called "Scheme-96" to develop the presidential decree "On Increasing Citizens' Interest in Keeping Savings in USSR Savings Bank Establishments."

According to this scheme, new interest rates on deposits and credits are established for all credit institutions. In other words, it is rigidly prescribed how much a bank should pay to enterprises for the use of their unattached resources and how much enterprises should pay the bank for borrowing money from it.

Strictly speaking, the very fact of the rigid regulation of interest rates is absurd. It is contrary to the idea of commercializing our banking system's activity—the very foundation of the switch to market relations. In any event, no single economically developed country uses such measures. And even if they were used at one time they were abolished because they encouraged the banks to perpetrate a great many abuses.

The scale of the interest rates proposed in the scheme is equally astonishing. For the term most widely used by commercial banks for the loan of money—about three years—the rate on deposits has a ceiling of seven percent, while for credits it is eight percent. And thus the difference (margin) between them, which is the banks' profit, will fluctuate around one percent. How are they supposed to stand on their own feet in that case?

But that is not all. As is well known, one year ago a 60 (!) percent tax was imposed on commercial banks. That is nothing less than highway robbery. But if you combine that tax with the new interest rates the banks have no money left either to form reserve or insurance funds, to buy equipment, or to advertise, not to mention charity. Instead they will have to go begging if not to the church then to the door of our almighty departments.

Perhaps this is the main aim of "Scheme-96"—to prevent the new bank structures from developing and to preserve the influence of the administrative command apparatus here. And in pursuit of that aim some people do not balk even at what are obvious absurdities.

For example, the letter of instruction says that before the New Year all banks must rewrite existing contracts in the light of the new interest rates. But no contract is retrospective, any more than any law is. Ultimately, under the new conditions these contracts would possibly not have been concluded at all. And the demand to rewrite them is tantamount to saying: You do the work and we will count the money for you.

Thus, "Scheme-96," which seemed to have been devised to implement the decree of the country's president, is effectively blocking that decree. More than that, it is undermining the authority of the president himself because it transforms his decisions from market ones into antimarket ones. And that fact cannot be ignored here.

Rules of the utmost importance for the new banking system and indeed for the country's whole economy are being introduced by some letter of instruction signed by a deputy chairman of the USSR Gosbank even though perhaps this requires a special government resolution so that someone is accountable for any future losses. What is this then—a fear of responsibility or an attempt to bring in through the back door a decision which benefits the administrative command apparatus?

Why ultimately did no one consult with the republic governments and banks about the new interest rate scales? After all, this also undermines the prestige of the president, who issued a decree back in July to the effect that all questions in the sphere of reforming the banking system must be resolved by all the interested sides together.

However, I do not want to make it seem as though the republics are the aggrieved parties here. Their reforms do not pay very much attention to the center's position either. For example, Russia's Gosbank is now embarking come what may on the creation of its own banking structures. Furthermore, no one seems to have noticed yet that Russia is carrying out its own radical transformations without even having adopted the necessary banking laws.

In brief, there are presidential decrees and there are isolated, uncoordinated actions both at the center and in the republics. Hardly anyone stands to gain from this. It will hardly strengthen our belief in rapid changes.

Shipment Problems Blamed for Sugar Shortages

PM1311115190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by I. Taburinskaya: "There Is Sugar, and Yet There Is None"]

[Text] Although there are 1.3 million tonnes of sugar stocks in storehouses in plants, sugar is counted as a product in short supply in the stores.

In the past few days the USSR Ministry of Railways held its latest telephone conference—the fourth—on the problems involved in sugar transportation. Taking part in its work were railroad chiefs, officials from the USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of Trade and the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases, food industry representatives, and plant directors.

It is not so often that you hear of gratitude to the railroad workers, but this time there was a great deal. The point is that the leadership of the sector went on the offensive against the latest shortage and instructed all railroads to consider sugar a priority.

N. Konarev, minister of railways, reported that previous conferences, operational checks, and monitoring of this problem had produced positive results.

But we are still a long way from a complete solution to this problem. The point is that many plants are deliberately delaying the shipment of sugar. The stocks of sugar at storehouses total 1.3 million tonnes. Every day approximately 90,000 tonnes more are produced. Most of the stocks (over 1 million tonnes) come from enterprises in the Ukraine, where 193 of the country's 318 refineries are located.

In total, 41 of the country's oblasts are now on sugar rationing because of shortfalls in deliveries from the Ukraine. For example, orders for 17,000 tonnes of sugar for Chelyabinsk City and Oblast for November have yet to be accepted, and it is still unclear who will supply 2,000 tonnes for Kemerovo. It has still to be determined which Ukrainian refineries will supply 3,000 tonnes for Blagoveshchensk and 2,000 tonnes for Chita. Moreover the refineries have not made good last month's delivery shortfall. So that the Ukrainian government's decision not to export from its territory goods that are produced there has hit the people hard and created yet another artificial shortage on an all-Union scale.

There was a separate discussion about Moscow and Leningrad. The situation is somewhat different there. Sugar is being supplied but it is not being efficiently unloaded. Thus there are now 214 cars standing on the Moscow railroad loaded with unclaimed sugar, and meanwhile there is clearly not enough in the city.

Perm Food Situation Termed 'Explosive'

914F0038A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Yu. Shatalov under the heading "The Situation in the Kama River Region—What Will We Eat This Winter?": "In the Grip of Extortion"]

[Text] Perm Oblast—Chicken was delivered to one of the Perm stores on Kuybyshev Street. A crowd immediately gathered at the counter. The customers were waited upon in turn, but a hitch developed when an 80-year-old woman reached the counter. It turned out that the one coupon she was holding was not enough to purchase a whole chicken. The young woman behind the counter refused to cut the chicken and demanded one more coupon.

"I live alone and I cannot get a second," the customer humbly explained.

The shop assistant clearly did not believe her and threatened: Either one more coupon or good riddance. Aggrieved by such a turn of events, the old woman pulled the death certificate of her husband from her shopping bag and with tears in her eyes she addressed her offender:

"What am I supposed to do now—die?"

But the heart of the young woman was not touched.

"It is because of people like you that there is nothing to eat for healthy people," she retorted with irritation.

Only after the intervention of the store's most conscientious customers was the mockery of the elderly citizen halted.

It would hardly be worth dwelling in detail on this incident if it were not characteristic of the current situation in Perm and the oblast. It is continuing to worsen and has already become explosive. G. Bondarenko, deputy director of the department of trade of the Perm Gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee], had good reason to reply sorrowfully to my questions on the occasion of the food crisis:

"I get the impression that we are all sitting on a powderkeg...."

It is easy to convince oneself that Gennadiy Nikolayevich is not exaggerating by stopping in any city

grocery store—matches, sugar, eggs, cereal, noodles, flour, fresh seafood, vegetable oil, and potatoes, never mind meat and sausage, have disappeared from the shelves as though blown away by the wind. And then a day does not go by without new reports more alarming than the last: Because of a shortage of raw materials, the confectionery factory is standing idle; there is hardly any life at the meat plants; at the margarine plant there are no covers for the mayonnaise jars.... There are only half as many potatoes as are needed for free sale....

In short, the residents of Perm are very alarmed. Questions fly in each instance: What is happening? What guarantees are there that there will not be famine in coming months in this city of a million inhabitants? What measures is the leadership taking to head it off? I mentioned these things to F. Shemin, chairman of the city soviet of people's deputies. His response was devastating:

"No one can guarantee anything in our troubled times. There are still no new stores of food goods—they will appear in the middle of the first quarter. As for the present moment, much is unclear."

One certainly cannot call the situation serene. For instance, the residents of Perm can largely thank the Baltic republics, which have halted deliveries of frozen fish, for the disappearance of that product; and it can thank the Ukraine and Kursk and Voronezh Oblasts for the sugar shortage. Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays and Astrakhan Oblast have sharply reduced deliveries of beef and poultry....

The list may be continued, but it is clear in any case that the economic ties of the regions are breaking before our eyes and that no one considers it a point of honor to fulfill their obligations carefully any more. The previously unquestioned rule that "the contract is worth more than the money" has been replaced by vulgar utilitarianism and Bronze Age barter. The leadership of the aforementioned Kursk Oblast, for example, proposed a transaction with the residents of Perm this autumn: You send us 200 vehicles for the beet harvest, and in the fourth quarter we will deliver a stock of sugar to you. With great difficulty the oblast's soviet of people's deputies persuaded drivers to take their vehicles to distant Kursk even though the vehicles were urgently needed on their own fields where hundreds of tonnes of potatoes and vegetables were perishing. But the Kursk managers were not troubled by that.

"Recently it became known that in exchange for that stock of sugar they demanded nine kilometers of cable," said G. Bondarenko. "There was nothing we could do. We had to search for that ill-fated cable...."

It should be noted that practically all the producers of agricultural products with whom the residents of Perm do business are involved to some degree in open extortion. There was a hope that the bacchanalia would end with the publication of the USSR Presidential Ukase "On Immediate Measures To Stabilize Economic Ties in the Fourth Quarter of 1990 and in the Course of 1991." But, alas, the hopes are not being justified: Some producers are unexpectedly willing to pay any fines and still will not deliver the food inasmuch as they have the opportunity to conclude a profitable transaction with other consumers who will compensate them with interest for all losses.

So why has the population of an oblast so unique in its economic potential found itself in the position of a wretched suppliant? It is begging from everyone: The central and republic governments, the ministries and departments, the numerous suppliers.... Would it not be simpler to abandon the rules of good form and force others to respect us with return sanctions, as our neighbors in Sverdlovsk decided to do after they had been reduced to despair? After all, we have the means to sober up those managers who are in it for everything they can get.

"We are paying close attention to how events develop in Sverdlovsk Oblast, but we are not supporters of such a method of resolving food problems," said R. Shvabskiy, chairman of the oblast soviet of people's deputies.

"We need legislative acts obligating producers to compensate consumers for all types of losses because of interruptions in deliveries of certain products," believes B. Mazuka, deputy chairman of the Perm Oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee]. "We must ruthlessly 'crush' negligent suppliers by economic means and not simply try to persuade them."

It should be mentioned that this proposal is not a novelty: In all civilized countries with a market economy those producers who have dared to trifle with consumers are brought to their senses in this manner. But for us it is as far to a real market as it is to China on foot, and where is the guarantee that such a legislative act will not be stillborn under conditions of a transition period which may last for long years? At this point it becomes clear that we have nothing to fall back on but the familiar and thrice-damned administrative methods of regulating economic ties. Reality is harsh; should we ignore it and run, full steam ahead... into chaos?

I foresee a question: What of Perm Oblast itself? Have its lands become so depleted that it has become unable even to offer some relief to the population? The issue is a complex one. In the Kama River region there are 0.65 hectares of arable land for each inhabitant. The experience of countries with developed agro-industrial sectors shows that this is quite sufficient to feed the more than 3 million people residing in the Western Urals. However, it should not be forgotten that each North American private farmer, for example, has basic funds worth $120,000 at his disposal while the Perm peasant hardly has 20,000 rubles.

The task, it would seem, is understood by everyone—we must saturate our kolkhozes and sovkhozes [collective and state farms] with efficient machinery, erect modern

production facilities, processing enterprises, and storehouses at a forced pace, develop the social infrastructure, and actively provide incentives for the labor of private farmers, leaseholders, and all rural inhabitants possessing market gardens. In reality, however, we are observing quite another scene: Little or no new equipment is making it to the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and the quality of the equipment is poor. Kolkhoz and sovkhoz suppliers are searching the wide world for construction machinery like the Argonauts after the golden fleece. Machinery may finally be found, but at what price? For instance, the amount of beef and poultry in the Kama region grew by 8,000 tonnes in comparison with last year, but 4,000 fewer tonnes of meat were handed over to the collecting centers for procured produce. What does this indicate? That 12-13,000 tonnes of a food product in high demand (three-fourths of the produce that goes toward subsidies) goes out beyond the borders of the oblast in exchange for vehicles, tractors, agricultural machinery, slate, brick, metal, and other construction materials. It is quite possible that the same is happening with milk, grain, and other agricultural products.

Can this outflow be halted? It not only can, it must. To do this it is first of all necessary to raise the material responsibility of producers of agricultural equipment for its timely delivery to the workers in the village, to bring its prices into correspondence with common sense, to concern ourselves with the quality and reliability of machinery and equipment, and to create a regimen for the kolkhozes and sovkhozes that favors the purchase of construction materials.

Workers Protest Lost Jobs at Rostov Nuclear Plant

PM1411092990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2120 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Report by A. Abramenko and V. Svetov; from the "Television News Service" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Ecological problems are increasingly affecting our life. At the Rostov AES [nuclear electric power station] 165 specialists are facing unemployment.

[Reporter] This far-from-rosy prospect has started taking on realistic features for the nuclear power station workers when, under pressure from the public, the Russian government adopted the decision to halt the construction of the Rostov AES which is located in Volgodonsk. Alas, this merely led to an exchange of roles between the sides. Now it is the nuclear power station workers, concerned about their future, who are organizing pickets in the city since, owing to a lack of funds, neither the city soviet nor the power station, whose fate has essentially been sealed, is capable of providing the social guarantees promised by the government. This is the first consequence.

Is it true that an order for the first dismissals at the station is in preparation?

[Unidentified power station official] Yes, the order is practically ready and will be signed in the very near future, entailing a reduction in staff of 165 people. Management has been forced to take this step.

[Reporter] It is not difficult to guess what will happen to the remaining 2,000 staffers and their families in view of the fact that most of the country's energy complex enterprises are switching to economic-contract forms of operation as from the New Year. It seems that the workers of the unfinished Rostov AES will have to sell it off bit by bit to make ends meet. There is no other option.

Lenin Auto Plant To Expand Through Sale of Stock

PM0911105790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Report by L. Elin; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] On the eve of the holiday, one of our best known enterprises—the Lenin Komsomol automobile plant—celebrated its 60th birthday. Its history is, you know, one of rise and fall. The modest, reliable Moskvich, which at one time won just renown, has begun to lose its prestige, like the automobile plant, moreover, particularly over the last few years. It is only now—seven years after the beginning of reconstruction work at the association—that it can be said to have emerged from the crisis.

[Elin] This year the plant will produce 105,000 automobiles. A few days ago they attained the daily rate of 450 vehicles. This means that next year 120,000 automobiles will come off the conveyors, and in two years' time 160,000 Moskvich 2141's. This is, of course, not very many given our unmitigated shortage of transportation. Moreover, the range of vehicles produced is also poor. What does the future hold? Utilizing the opportunities provided by the organization of flexible production, the designers have planned the development of a whole family of new automobiles. The joint-stock company which is to be discussed in the future should help this. So, to the new models. Here they are. The Pikap—with its carrying capacity of up to 1200 kg with trailer—is designed for transporting small loads in town and countryside. Production is to begin next year, along with retail sales, moreover. I think that even the fussiest of motorists will like this car—the Moskvich 2142 sedan. This model boasts an integral computer, large capacity, comfort, and economy. The so-called commercial Moskvich 3733 and 2139 Arbat: The former is a station wagon-cum-minibus, while the latter can be used as a cab or large family car. The models are being assembled at the association's plants in Saratov and Kaluga Oblasts. All models have the potential for modification. They will be fitted with the association's own engines. They are to be produced in 1993 or 1994. Lastly, the car of the future—the Istra—of aluminum construction, with sophisticated electronics and average fuel consumption of roughly three liters per 100 km. Weight, using new

materials, is less than 700 kg. Environmentally clean fuel is envisaged. Production is to begin in 1999.

[A.Ye. Sorokin, chief designer at the Lenin Komsomol Automobile Plant] The plant has elaborated a program—the number of automobiles produced under this program should rise to 300,000 vehicles a year. The plan is to switch our association within three years to a joint-stock form of activity. We invited a firm with experience of this work to implement this scheme. The firm is CSFB—an international bank with its headquarters in London. Under the new conditions of economic activity workers and the state cannot be barred from management of the enterprise, that is, they must be a component. First, 100 percent [as heard], the first tranche of shares will be distributed among the participants. Who are they? First and foremost the state, perhaps both the central government and the Russian government and the local authorities. While the following 50 percent, the next tranche, will be sold off. They will also be sold to plant workers. All this will enable us to implement the entire program we have outlined within two or three years.

Bashkiriya Plant Gears Up To Produce Fiat Cars

PM1311144590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Report by A. Gerasimov, A. Lapytov, and Ye. Terekhov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Recently the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a resolution to create a joint Soviet-Italian enterprise for the production of small cars. This marks an end to the numerous disputes concerning the fate of the Yelabuga auto plant.

[Reporter] It is planned to produce cars like these in Yelabuga. They are Pandas, which the Italian Fiat company has been producing since 1986. They are attractive yet relatively inexpensive—the envisaged price based on this year's costs is 5,500 rubles. The first car is to come off the production line at this plant in 1993. Six hundred thousand of these cars, including modified versions, will be manufactured in Yelabuga, and another 300,000 will be manufactured in a rayon in Bashkiriya. Thus, construction work at the plant is picking up speed.

Our country has seen quite a number of giant "projects of the century." The construction of the Yelabuga auto plant comes into this category.

We do not yet have the final figures. The contract with Fiat will be signed in the near future. But you can get an idea of the scale of capital investment involved—these framework structures (originally for a tractor plant that was never finished) cost the Soviet taxpayers more than R1 billion. From what sources will this plant be funded?

[R. Karachunin, general director of the Yelabuga Auto Plant] We regard the construction of this huge auto plant as a statewide task, because it will entail the development of practically all sectors of the national economy—the chemical, metallurgical, and aviation industries, the river fleet, and others. And the railroads. As this is a statewide task, funding should also come from the state, that is the budget.

[Reporter] The giant Yelabuga auto plant is being built in a region which is literally saturated with industry that is harmful to the environment. Will the birth of the plant not produce an ecological catastrophe in this part of Tataria?

[Karachunin] Our planners are building in production processes which will fully safeguard the environment.

[Reporter] The new auto plant is being constructed in difficult economic conditions. But if all goes according to plan, the plant management believes, this new small car will fully satisfy demand in our country for automobiles of this kind.

'Militarized' Udmurt Faces Conversion Problems

PM1311134390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by A. Sabirov: "You Cannot Exchange Missiles for Cigarettes"]

[Text] Izhevsk—The draft USSR Law on the Conversion of the Defense Industry prepared by the Union government has been submitted for judgment by legislature, business circles, and the general public of Udmurtia.

Even for the Urals, the "buttress of the country," this republic looks extremely militarized. A total of 80 percent of its industrial potential is made up of military installations that serve the Union and are also closely interlinked with each other.

Under the draft law, collectives are expected to be given notification that they are to stop producing various types of weapons and military hardware within the next two years. And in practice there is already a significant reduction in production, which has caught manufacturers unawares.

"Today we the are hostages of an economic system that is geared to militaristic aims," V. Tubylov, chairman of the Udmurt Republic Supreme Soviet, says. "On the threshold of the market we cannot obtain even centrally allocated materials without begging and humiliation. And you cannot exchange the best missiles in the world even for very bad cigarettes, although we are reaching the 'tobacco' strike stage."

Importance of Increasing Output Stressed

PM1311105390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Nov 90 Second Edition p 1

[Article by Vasiliy Parfenov under the "Talking Point" rubric: "To Share Out or To Produce"]

[Text] It is laughable that even now, when the market is knocking on our door, we call the increasingly generous distribution of unearned rubles and unsupplied goods "an increase in monetary incomes." Read any USSR Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics] summary of the economy's development. The section on incomes begins as follows: "The population's monetary incomes were.... The average monthly wage of workers and employees reached...."

However, I am loath to applaud the increase in these "incomes" because there are simply no goods, so that prices in the kolkhoz [collective farm] market and also in the state trade sector are going up more and more steeply. And this is in the current year, which has been most benign weather-wise.

It is now important for economists to articulate the main reasons for the shortages in order to clear the economic minefield through which the country is advancing toward the market. You do not have to be a Vasiliy Leontyev or John Galbraith to understand that we will not get out of the mire if we continue generously handing out unearned rubles, burying them in the ruins of never-ending construction projects, and making gifts to our ideological fellows abroad. I say frankly that some politicians and even the wisest of economists are not so much setting course for the creation of wealth but rather talking about how best to divide what we still have left.

Others repeat like an incantation part of the well-known motto "...to each according to his labor." However, when doing so they "forget" the first part of this motto—"from each according to his abilities...." Which is, of course, unpopular among those whose elementary laziness prevents them from showing these abilities of theirs. As regards the motto "To each according to his labor," many people listening to populist speeches understand it in simplified form. Once a man passes the factory gate in the morning he thinks that he is already working. Once he leaves the factory at the prescribed time after the shift it means that the timekeeper flourishes a figure "8" against the hard worker's name. The man has "worked" so many hours. And if in addition he has actually carried out a task, then be so kind as to add another bonus to the wages on payday. And how many hundreds of millions of rubles are given out to specialists and academic nonproducers, to suppliers who do not supply, to construction workers who construct no facilities, to planners who create disproportions on an all-Union scale?

The result is lamentable: We hand out money, but fewer and fewer goods are added for every ruble of wages.

And here is another dangerous phenomenon. If you want to obtain grain, you are asked to send carloads of metal; for paper, which has become particularly scarce nowadays, plants are demanding foreign toilet equipment.... It seems that we are preparing not for a civilized market but for a transition to a medieval bazaar.

It is only a matter of weeks until the new year, yet many enterprises do not have a precise state order, do not know how many or what goods to produce, and to whom they should deliver them. Recently a packed conference of planners and representatives of all sectors was held at the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee]. The topic was a pressing one: How to start the new year, increase the output of goods, and ease shortages without stoppages. The conference lit up the darkness: The Gosplan's authority is waning, and local soviets and enterprises are not rushing to take it up. It is every man for himself.

How many hopes we have pinned on conversion, justifiably expecting to have seen some return by now. But what did the conference demonstrate? Next year military complex plants will turn out 6.3 million refrigerators and freezers, although only 4.3 million will be sent to the trade sector. The remainder will themselves be "traded" for the highest prices, exchanged for other goods. Let us stop and think here: Are we entering the initial stage of the transition to the market in the correct way?

"Where have all the fabrics gone," "Oh, for some chintz!" readers write to the newspapers. And we are not only decreasing output but also sending huge quantities of raw and semifinished textiles abroad. Last year we dispatched 1.8 billion rubles [R] worth of these goods. And in order to avoid shutting our own factories we had to buy the same raw material for R1.1 billion. Furthermore, we sold our fabrics at an average of 46 kopeks a meter but bought it from firms at 74 kopeks.

Those who are fond of distributing rather than producing and of breaking economic contracts while themselves making demands of others are put in their place by the USSR president's decree "On Urgent Measures To Stabilize Economic Ties in the Fourth Quarter of 1990 and During 1991." The reasoning behind the requirements is this: "Go to the market, but don't make a mess of it." For the decree to be put into practice, a specific culprit must pay out of his own pocket for every instance of business disorganization. Our economy's fortunes during transition to the market are being decided not by the strength of vocal cords but by the competition of minds and the dexterity of hands. Before you can divide something, you have to make it.

New Steel Complex Starts Up in Magnitogorsk

PM0911085890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 8 Nov 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Magnitogorsk—On the eve of October Magnitogorsk's Lenin Metallurgical Plant hot-tested a new oxygen converter plant among a complex of machines for continuous steel casting. The new plant was built in an unprecedentedly short period—five years. The startup of the complex has been impatiently awaited at Magnitka, above all because when it fully comes on stream it will be possible to halt production of semi-outdated and worn-out components and improve the environmental situation in the city.

Agricultural

Cities Favor Land Sale More Than Countryside

PM1311143990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent V. Gavrichkin: "Land for Sale? It Seems So; But the Whole Question Is How To Do This, in What Form?"]

[Excerpt] The All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion has conducted a sociological investigation on the right to land, including the free sale of land among the population of Russia. According to an INTERFAX report, the following data were obtained.

Among those polled in Moscow and Leningrad, 64 percent were in favor of the free sale of plots of land, 12 percent were opposed, and 22 percent found it difficult to answer. In oblast centers and small cities, the "votes" were distributed as follows: 57, 26, and 16 percent and 70, 16, and 14 percent, respectively. In the opinion of sociologists, the insistent demand for free trade in land on the part of inhabitants of small cities is due to the fact that, even now, a considerable proportion of the food they consume is from intensively cultivated, tiny garden and truck garden plots.

The position is different for Russia's rural inhabitants: 46 percent are for and 42 against, while 12 percent of those polled found it hard to reply. In other words, support there for the buying and selling of land is minimal, while resistance is maximal. But on the whole, the sociologists concluded, the data show that there are many people in the Russian Federation who are ready, given the appropriate legal guarantees, to acquire land and to farm their own plot. [passage omitted]

Leukosis Spread Exposes Veterinary Standards

PM1311160790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by V. Trach, Donetsk Oblast chief state physician, and correspondent N. Lisovenko, followed by commentary by economic observer I. Abakumov under the general heading: "Alarming Coincidences"]

[Text] Donetsk—In the same way as AIDS is advancing on mankind, leukoses are advancing in cattle. Veterinarians are in despair. Introduced after the war, the disease is capturing more and more bridgeheads. In Donetsk Oblast, for example, just four out of 432 farms are now considered "healthy."

Specialists note the very alarming coincidence of the territories to which the diseases have spread: Lymphatic and hematopoietic tissues in people are affected in almost the same localities as there are sick livestock. And the level of morbidity is growing menacingly, as evidenced by statistics for 30 of the oblast's cities and rayons over the past 10 years.

No one has yet confirmed or disproved a direct link between diseases of people and livestock. But, nevertheless, veterinary science intuitively tries to take measures against the possible infection of humans. All the instructions adopted over many years attest to this. Here is an extract from a recent one: "Milk from IDR-positive (IDR stands for immune diffusion reaction) animals kept in isolation from a herd being treated is pasteurized on the farm at a temperature of 80 degrees for at least 20-30 seconds, after which it is permitted to be delivered to the dairy or to be used within the farm." This instruction was drawn up by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic State Agro-industrial Committee Main Veterinary Science Administration in August 1990 and agreed with the Ukrainian Ministry of Health.

But an instruction dated 29 December 1984, which contains many absurdities, also operates in the country. For example, milk from cows with clinical signs of leukosis is to be boiled and may be used only to fatten animals, while milk from cows suspected of having leukosis but without clinical manifestations goes to the dairy in the normal way. It is recommended that sick animals be slaughtered in a sanitary abattoir or, if there is not one, "on a general conveyor after the slaughter of healthy animals is completed..."

Let's not be naive—in reality, in our meat combines and dairies livestock products everywhere move in a single flow, and all these well-meaning instructions have no effect on this flow. Moreover, press censorship has always kept such secrets from the population.

By the way, 20-30 years ago the use of milk from sick animals in food was very strictly prohibited, and it was proposed to destroy it or to feed it to calves produced by cows sick with leukosis. A reasonable question arises: If veterinarians in the sixties were afraid for people's health, why are these fears now being allayed? Has it really been proved that the animal leukosis virus is totally harmless to humans? We put this question to the Kharkov and Kiev Scientific Research Institutes of Experimental Veterinary Science, the Odessa Veterinary Institute, the Kiev Scientific Research Institute of Food Hygiene, and the Kharkov Institute of Epidemiology and Microbiology, and everywhere we received the reply that not one scientific collective has tackled this problem and that little study has been made of the virus. Hence the conclusion: The possibility of the leukosis virus' being transmitted from an animal to a person cannot be totally ruled out, and measures to protect people against this misfortune have not been elaborated.

[Abakumov] There is no point in being coy: We are dealing with a phenomenon which is assuming the ungovernable nature of a natural disaster. It is, of course, a question not only of Donetsk Oblast and not only of livestock leukosis but of the state of the country's veterinary service as a whole. The facts of mass diseases of animals that are dangerous to people, which can be published in the press only with considerable difficulty,

show just a few consequences of the methodical destruction of the prestige of the Soviet veterinary school and the loss of its independence from departmental interests.

Veterinary services in the countryside come under the leadership of collective and state farms, which have to fulfill the meat and milk sales plans. In meat combines and dairies veterinary physicians are also materially dependent on management. Under conditions when the functions of independent state control have been practically lost, anything can happen and be concealed: There is no one to sound the alarm. And frequently there is nothing with which to diagnose a disease in time and nowhere to do so: There is a shortage of both laboratories and medicines. At the cost of a big effort we managed to halt and eliminate an epidemic of foot-and-mouth disease not long ago. Brucellosis is still being detected now here, now there. Although they have no personal means of protection, veterinary physicians carry out numerous vaccinations and treatments of animals against the most dangerous diseases—plague, anthrax, rabies—risking their own health and preventing losses of at least 15 percent of the value of all agricultural produce. The direct harm to the country's economy from infectious livestock diseases runs into billions of rubles, but no one has yet set about calculating the harm from attendant diseases in people. The problem is merely being exacerbated in connection with the tendency to break up large farms into small ones: More extensive control, precisely state control, over the state of livestock units is needed.

This situation has prompted professionals to unite in the USSR Veterinary Association and, on behalf of the constituent congress held recently in Novosibirsk, to put specific proposals directly to the USSR president for the adoption of Fundamentals of Veterinary Legislation within the package of Union Treaty documents.

Diseases do not recognize borders. It has to be remembered that whereas the physician treats the person, the veterinarian keeps an eye on the health of mankind. This is axiomatic for civilized countries.

Scientific

Mir Cosmonauts' Situation Updated

LD1111100290 Moscow TASS in English 0954 GMT 11 Nov 90

[By unattributed TASS correspondent at Mission Control Center]

[Text] Moscow November 11 TASS—The Soviet cosmonauts are continuing their work aboard the orbiting platform Mir.

Gennadiy Manakov and Gennadiy Strekalov are scheduled today to do astrophysical and technical experiments, as well as maintenance work on the service module's equipment, and run checks on scientific instruments to be used in future research.

In the afternoon, they will correct the platform's orbit by using the propulsion units of the Progress M-5 cargo spacecraft.

In keeping with their programme of geophysical studies, the cosmonauts carried out a series of experiments to measure the spectral characteristics of the earth's atmosphere, in particular its ozone layer in the tropical belt.

The two men continue to use the Gallar and Krater-V installations to grow monocrystals of the semiconducting material gallium arsenide.

According to reports from orbit and telemetry data, Mir's flight is proceding as normal. Both cosmonauts are in good health.

Citizens Protest Novaya Zemlya Nuclear Test

LD1111042190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2200 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Text] A recent test of a nuclear device on Novaya Zemlya caused an angry protest by the inhabitants of the Arctic village port of Dikson. Local weathermen were the first in the country to learn about this test. They noted anomalous warm changes in the upper atmosphere over the island while analyzing space photographs.

An appeal was sent to the country's president. In it was noted that the Arctic, being a high cyclone activity zone, is completely unsuitable for such tests. A predominant bearing of apparent winds from the Atlantic can subject the northern part of Taymyr and its coastal area to radioactive pollution.

The inhabitants of Diksonskiy Rayon insist that ecological commission be set up for an independent examination of the Novaya Zemlya testing ground.

Parasitic Disease Figures Understated

PM1311131790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 90 Union Edition p 6

[Article by S. Tutorskaya: "Doctors Alarmed at Growth in Parasitic Diseases"]

[Text] Western press commentaries have been sounding the alarm about the WHO report on the worldwide growth in parasitic diseases.

No less than 500 million people are suffering from parasitic diseases. The largest rise has been in malaria (270 million people a year). It is noted that serious parasitic diseases are more common in places where sanitation standards are poor. Incompetent farming can lead to an increased risk of infection. And, unfortunately, serious outbreaks are a sorry and unavoidable concomitant of sedition and civil war....

What is the situation in our country? According to figures from V. Sergiyev, director of the Institute of Medical Parasitology, 4.5 million people in our country are affected every year. We do not have any complete

state statistics. For instance, we used to have an antimalaria service. But it was closed down after the war owing to the success in the fight against malaria. But malaria has not been "closed down" worldwide.... V. Sergiyev says that malaria is now being brought in again from Afghanistan.

Given that there are virtually no courses in parasitology in medical schools and that not all laboratories have modern detection methods, very many cases in our country go unrecorded. Not so long ago a severely ill man with a chronic leg sore contacted the institute. The possibility of amputation was raised. An analysis at the institute established that the sore had been caused by a tiny parasite that lives in various animal and human soft tissues. After a course of treatment everything was fine.

The institute wondered by how many the number of people suffering from parasitic diseases exceeds the official figures. The answer turned out to be by a factor of 2-3 times for some diseases, and by a factor of even 15-17 times for others. On average, the scientists concluded that the number of sufferers was 10 (!) times higher. That is, 45 million rather than 4.5 million.

The doctors are very concerned about the growth in disease as a result of the use of polluted unboiled water. Furthermore, animal husbandry and the keeping of household pets requires a knowledge of elementary rules. The solution is to set up a network of laboratories where fish and meat can be checked.

More active coverage of sanitation is also needed. And useful information will hurt nobody: Well-cooked meat and fish are harmless...

Is it not time to immediately set up the necessary services and to train doctors and develop laboratories properly? And do not forget the following: The official statistics need to be multiplied by 10 to be accurate.

Military

'Shield' Leader Says Yazov Resignation Imminent

LD1311185790 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1649 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, Nov 13 (TANJUG)—Leader of the "Shield" Alliance for the protection of military personnel's rights Vitaliy Urazhtsev has stated that the question of the resignation of Soviet Defence Minister Marshal Dmitriy Yazov is "practically resolved." His statement was this evening quoted by the domestic INTERFAX agency which said that Urazhtsev had not given the source of this information, but made it clear that only several days would pass before this resignation would be made public.

He also said that Yazov would be succeeded by his hitherto deputy and Commander of the Warsaw Pact Forces Lt.-Gen. Piotr Lushev.

Several days ago Marshal Yazov, in an interview, criticized the organization Shield and its leadership for extremism and irresponsibility. It is difficult to verify whether the spreading of this report represents avenge by the Shield leaders who feel offended.

This organization has recently proposed that Tatia Koryagina should be minister of defence of Russia. Koryagina is otherwise an economist and one of the activists of the most radical wing in the left groupings of Russia.

Gorbachev Addresses Servicemen 13 Nov

LD1311181490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Speech by President Mikhail Gorbachev to Soviet servicemen in Moscow on 13 November—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrades! I consider this meeting to be a very important one for all of us, not only those present representing famous institutions of our state, but also the whole of our society as well. In this connection I share the opinion that has been voiced here—and comrades have sent me several notes—that they hope this direct and open discussion between military deputies, people's deputies from among the servicemen, will be conveyed to the whole country and that people will become familiar with your position. I am in favor of this, and I think the comrades present here who are representing our press will immediately occupy themselves with this, as a shorthand report of the speeches has been made and the television is present here. So it must also be covered in detail, if not in full, in the newspapers; and our television has a special program devoted to the Armed Forces. This is a program which already enjoys... [changes thought] People know it and watch it in the country. One of the programs—and all the time that is needed must be devoted, without delay, of course, to transmitting it on television, as the majority of the country watches television. That is the first thing.

Comrades have also asked the question: Why has the address on my meeting with the leadership of the Russian Federation not been published? I asked: What address? And the comrades, at least, explained this to me: that the servicemen's deputies did not support the address that was prepared by the organizers of this meeting, and they put forward their own version. As this did not please the organizers of this meeting, they have persuaded you, all of you who are present here—and a few dozen from Russia have even supplemented those who are present—and you have agreed not to adopt any address. [murmurs from hall] Did this not happen? But you did not vote? You did not vote, nevertheless? So you have given way; you have given way. So there is nothing to publish. You did not adopt an address.

Listening to the speech by the representative of the Internal Troops—I think it was the Dzerzhinskiy Division—the officer who spoke here felt and conveyed his feeling from this meeting in Russia that both the draft decision which they wanted to adopt and their

approaches disguised very poorly the idea of sounding out the mood of the Army and using the deputies from Russia to state demands to the center, backed by the opinion of military people who are at the same time deputies.

If this is the case—if this is the case—then I have to say I resolutely oppose such methods of action, even more so playing such a card as the USSR Armed Forces. No one is allowed to play with such matters! For this there is the established constitutional procedure. It is known that the Armed Forces are at the disposal of the state—I will be returning to this later—under whose command they are. [applause] This is what we need to proceed from. [applause] This is what we need to proceed from. That is why, exactly as I reject any speculation on a military coup, imputing things again to our Army, and exposing it—that it is, so to speak, hatching here some sinister plans, deep within itself, and soon—this must also be resolutely rejected before the entire country and the entire world. [applause] The Army knows its role, its responsibuility [applause], and it will always be with the people. [applause]

This is with regard to the significance and dedication of the conversation taking place here, at this meeting. The only thing, I think, that needs to be rejected is that this meeting is taking place as a result of an ultimatum issued to the president. I (?even)...[changes thought] I did not know that this was an ultimatum. If this were an ultimatum I would not have put in an appearance—however much I respect you, don't forget. If this is the case I reject this. I do not want it to be recorded here that the president put in an appearance, as he had been required to do so, and so on. That does not so. I came here when I was told that at the meeting a desire had been expressed to meet me. I at once made a reply.

Now to the point, inasmuch as there is still a stack of questions here, and I must somehow attempt to briefly reply to them, albeit cursorily. But nevertheless a few remarks.

Well, above all, comrades, you and I are of course holding this meeting in a real context, which characterizes the situation in the country. You and I—all of us—are unable to discuss anything without bearing in mind all these processes, fundamental processes, that are taking place and concern the whole of our life and affect all of us—and affect all of us—and affect us not simply as people who are politically biased—as people who are interested in politics—but they affect the fundamental vital interests of all of us.

This is what I would say if we are talking about the current moment: it has to be said that we are leaving behind the old forms of life, and this process is very painful. I think that anyone here who doubts that we are on the right track in principle, that we are pursuing this course to get away from the administrative command system, from this stuffiness in the sense of democracy and glasnost—we are getting away from the individual being excluded, having been excluded from the system that was in operation under the political regime, excluded from active participation in all the processes taking place in the state. [sentence as heard] I think comrades, that this conference shows what that produces. Could there be such a frank, direct conversation, raising all questions, starting from the prestigiousness and prestige of the Army and the serviceman, and ending with the simplest questions relating to people's everyday life not to mention equipment, and so on? Off course not. This is the result of that.

Indeed this conversation is going on in every region, in every political or other, economic, state institution. That is very important. It means we will be insured for the future against distortions of policy, against big mistakes. We will be insured, whether we are in the civilian sector or in the Army, against finding ourselves in the power of the appanage princes, and so on and so forth. This is the road to a normal civil law-governed state, where the law must triumph, where all the rights of all strata of the population are protected, and where relying on that law you can realize your potential.

So this is a sharp turn. If in getting away from all this we were renouncing ourselves and our history, and our grandfathers and fathers and mothers and what they did in their lives, I would simply stop respecting myself even if that is not the way you feel. No, we are getting away from the barracks forms of attempts to fulfill the socialist idea. We are getting away from the regime—which I spoke to you about—and from what it cost our society and what we have come to in the sense of development as a part of civilisation. Yes, we are getting away from that. We are getting away from it all. But on this soil lived our grandfathers, fathers, and mothers. They built their lives and did everything honestly. They sacrificed their health and formed a wall against fascism, and defended their country with incredible loss of life: millions, tens of millions, saved the country and saved other peoples from that brown plague. What is that?

Are these all lives which have been lived in vain? No, we do not accept this; we reject it, and we will never agree with those who want to say that our fathers—and we along with them—have lived and are living a life in vain. No, definitely not! [applause]

There are attempts to present it in this way—both our history and our affairs. At the same time deformation and the methods of Stalin [Stalinshchina], and everything connected with it, are actually being used here. Other stages have been characterized by other forms of life, perhaps more ennobling but also not providing, so to speak, real oxygen to the whole of society. We are moving away from that. That is what we are bidding farewell to. But all of us have our roots there, the lives of our fathers and forefathers, and those of us who are here, too—there are people sitting here who also have years of full life behind them. In other words, this is not just a parting. It is not a matter of it happening to someone somewhere else; it is happening to every one of us, and

within each one of us, and this is the hardest thing. Yes, it is difficult in the economy, yes, it is difficult in other spheres—the establishment of legislative power, executive power, judicial power. All this is very complex. When this was tackled simply in one office, a law was created, and everything was decided and destiny was determined. But you and I are seeing to it that this is a law-based state. All this coming into being is a very complex process. So long as we ourselves do not change, and fail to understand what we are bidding farewell to forever—what we are taking with us and what we are doing now, and what we are striving for in the sense of an objective—so long as we all do not make up our minds that this path demands that we be decisive, it will be difficult to proceed, and moreover there will be many obstacles, and much pain and worry. This is why the most important revolution is a revolution in the mind, in our heads, in ourselves. When I say that it proceeds painfully—this whole transition to new forms of life—I mean the economy, politics, the sphere of interethnic relations, the party and the Army, and other institutions. But still, I would describe this time of ours in this way, and I will repeat what I have been saying more than once these past few weeks or months. Our time is one of great opportunities and great dangers. This has to be seen, both one and the other, and it must be seen clearly. For example, I cannot permit myself—much as I would like to—to see changes for the better, and perhaps present them to you, before anything else. No.

I can see what perestroyka has yielded, what it has opened up for society and for the individual, and the dangers accompanying this process—a very profound one. Here I could argue like this: Take any revolution in all of history that we know. They all passed off very acutely and painfully. By saying that I might seem to have explained everything. No. Well, anyway. I am proceeding from—and those who are on my side, my closest associates in all these years in working out this concept of the policy of perestroyka—we are proceeding from the fact that having departed from nondemocratic forms of life, we must resolve all issues using democratic methods. Not in such a way that we will have whites and reds, blues and blacks again, that the witch hunt and searching for enemies will recur, that it will again turn into a civil war and confrontation, all the main losses from which, you understand, our people will again sustain. Together with you I feel it very sharply we did not succeed in preserving just such an approach to all issues everywhere. There are deaths already. There is grief already. They exist.

Nevertheless we have to do our best to avoid complete and utter civil confrontation and splitting society. This is what we have to do. All of us together, all of society. Here is a role for the state institutions, and the party, and such institutions as the Soviet Army. We have to do everything now to give solid support to all positive things, and to preserve all positive processes. Step by step we have to throttle all the negative destructive processes taking place in the society. I do not want to count them on my fingers; you named most of them here. They all are before our eyes. How can we do it? I think that we have approached it now. But before I start talking about it, in connection with it, I will say that of course everything that is taking place in society—and the Army is a part of society, is closely tied with society, and experiences all this for itself—and that this alarm was heard here concerning the destiny of the country and the destiny of socialism, concerning the people and the Army, everything that you acutely and sharply said here—I grasp all of it in full. It alarms me as much it does you.

I see in your remarks—and some said this correctly here—that things are being repeated here, and that the subject is one and the same thing. This indicates only that we are worried and concerned, and that we have been caught up by common problems which we must resolve. That is how I perceive these remarks by representatives from various areas and regions and districts of the country.

I think that we must give thought once again to everything you have said—though let me tell you bluntly, much that you have said here, if one leaves aside the details, is in principle something that I know, and this information is reported objectively by those whose job it is to do this, including by the Ministry of Defense. I should say that the times are now such that perhaps so many of you are repeating things. I receive, directly, documents adopted by a particular unit, at a particular Army party aktiv or some meeting of officers. So these documents come in directly from various channels, and inform the president and express their demands and wishes.

What do I see as our primary tasks? The same things that you do. First, there is political stability. I put this in first place. What is it connected with? With strengthening law and order, with the normal functioning of executive power, and with the cessation of the struggle between the supreme soviets and the struggle between the Union, Russian, local, and other laws. This requires, quite simply, urgent measures. This has been the subject of my recent meetings with the leaders of republics, krays, oblasts, and other regions. That is now the main theme that concerns everyone.

There are complications here. What are they? We are moving away from—leaving—some particular forms, and moving to a different legal order, different laws, which will indeed regulate within a Union treaty, but a renewed Union treaty. Naturally, until we enter into this transitional stage, it is very important not to permit any further integration [as heard] or destabilization of society. That is a concern for all—it is a common worry. All the representatives of repubics at the recent session of the Federation Council were united in cooperation. The republican supreme soviets began to adopt the corresponding laws—decisions—and they were adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet in order to ensure that executive power should function effectively. It is precisely in this direction that we will act in order to ensure

presidential decrees. Everything that he undertakes should be based on a real executive structure, though it still needs to be formed and created. That is the first thing—political stability.

The second thing: Virtually everyone here touched on the theme of interethnic relations, the transformation of our Union—a multinational state—into a union of sovereign states. Everyone put forward as a primary task getting round to adopting the Union treaty as soon as possible. You have evidently read the report—it was a short one—that the draft Union treaty was discussed within the framework of the Federation Council which, as you know, includes the republican leaders.

After discussion, this document is now being further elaborated, and it will, as a concept of the Union treaty, be submitted and published for public discussion within society, and will be forwarded to the republican supreme soviets, as they must sign the new Union treaty once it has been discussed, adopted, amended, clarified, and so forth. Yesterday I again dealt with this question—for several hours—together with specialists here in the center. They worked to implement the considerations voiced at the Federation Council and yesterday examined a version of the concept of the Union treaty. I think that we will complete this work in the space of a week to ten days, and will submit it so that it can be published and forwarded to the supreme soviets of Union republics. This is also the view of the leaders of Union republics; this is their view.

It was asked here what was talked about and whether there was discussion, on this topic as well, when I met Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin and others the day before yesterday. I think it was Comrade Kasirov who asked this question. I must say it was the central question, the main question, and both sides acknowledged that this is the central question of our life now, and that it requires a sound solution. Moreover, it is essential, timewise, to speed up this whole work, and it is important here—and I report this—first and foremost to have each other's positions set out.

Let me say that there have been no differences on the necessity to strengthen changes in the Union and achieve a union of sovereign states under conditions whereby this Union-based state is retained. There have been no differences. We have agreed that these positions will be promulgated and voiced publicly—that here there are no differences between the central leadership and the leadership of the Russian Federation. There is also an understanding of the enormous responsibility of the Russian Federation, first and foremost, of the peoples of the Russian Federation, for the destiny of this multinational state of ours.

That is the first thing, which I consider very important to tell you. We agreed simultaneously to work on the concept and its publication. Commissions from the center and the Russian Federation will be formed to study questions connected with the concept, and specific questions on the distribution of powers—and in connection with powers what relates to the center and what relates, is transferred to, the republic. So they are now practical questions which will be connected, and which will have to be relied on later, and on what will have to be done to implement the new draft Union treaty.

A number of practical questions in this context were discussed. I consider the conversation to have been responsible, serious, and constructive. I want to stress this, because a number of documents that have been adopted of late by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, about economic sovereignty, about the application of laws of the Union—I think they have all aroused the unease of both the people of Russia—what does that signify?—and in the Union overall, and naturally in the center. But I think that after such a fundamental exchange of opinion on this question, I have the confidence that both here in the center and in the leadership of Russia we will act in a spirit corresponding to the interests of our multinational state and all its peoples.

I think this is very important, because it is difficult to imagine that we could successfully resolve all the tasks connected with the renewal, with the attaining of a new Union treaty, without the active, constructive, and responsible role of Russia, the Russian people, and all peoples living in the huge republic. I think we all understand that.

As far as the transition to the market is concerned, there are many quetions being asked here. Movement to the market has begun, and I would like to speak on this because in connection with the transition to the market the question has arisen as to whether we are getting away from, changing, our social structure. No, I think we are not getting away from socialism, but going toward it through reformation of the ownership relations, through changing the situation of the individual in production and in relation to the means of production.

Today this is total state ownership, which practically deprives the labor collectives of the opportunity to influence both the functioning of the enterprises, under condititions where everything is totally in state hands, to have access to the final results, or in the final count, to live at all according to the results of their activity. This is indeed a return to what October started from. Factories for the workers, land for the peasants. Through reformation of ownership relations, people must be brought back as the main dramatis personae in the economy. Powerful incentives must be given; interests must be brought into action. Because overall, comrades, this is the main, difficult problem for socialists of all generations: to combine the real interest of man as an individual with his material interests in socialism, in the socialist idea. That is where it is going. Therefore, the process of taking things out of state hands will progress—above all, that of taking things out of state hands. From the creation of joint stock enterprises, people's enterprises.

How does a people's enterprise emerge? You lease it, and by working efficiently—this has already been done—you buy it out, and it becomes a people's enterprise. This is done through the cooperatives. Finally, we must create conditions so that our collective farms may try and see what they can do, and what is contained in these collective farms. Because now very powerful criticism is being heard against the activity of the collective farms, in the full sense of the word. They were instructed what to sow, in what proportions, what to do with what, and at what price. It is only with the exception of the past five or seven years, since about 1982, that the collective farms have been able to sell their produce, which restored, which ensured equivalent exchange with industry and other areas of the national economy. Up to the year 1982, everything that was done in the country was to a significant degree done through extracting profits from the collective and state farms on the basis of nonequivalent exchange. Yes, at this time agriculture has developed in a social respect and from the point of view of its material basis.

That is to say, prior to...[changes thought] I am confident that collective farms, when they have become very independent and avail themselves of this independence, will yet have their say. For activated here will be interests that do not exist in present-day collective and state farms. There will be possibilities in these large farms to use modern technology; this is characteristic of both agricultural firms and large farms. Or they will be farms that are not so big. On the whole, interests will operate there, through reforming land relationships and ownership relationships in the countryside—and technical process will operate. That is to say, we must do all of this, comrades.

What is this? A departure from socialism—some say private ownership. Yes, private ownership—I am sure—the people themselves will decide this. The people will decide this. But I think that we—and remaining within the framework of a socialist choice—we will bank on collective forms, on public forms of property, reforming in the spirit I have mentioned. I see that such is the people's mood.

It is being said: Let's sell this, let's sell that, let's sell the land. [voices heard muttering] This being the case.... Just a minute. [louder voices] What? [even louder voices] I cannot hear the question. What are you talking about? [loud shouts] Aha, this no longer interests you? [shouts of "no"]

It is not for nothing that I am talking to you about this. If, if everything here proceeds along the main direction of perestroyka, the Army will live and work in a totally different atmosphere. [sound of voices continues] I will come to this; I am paying special attention to the Army. Nevertheless, you must... [changes thought] I must tell you this now, because all the time there is a suspicion, a suspicion that someone has conceived and secretly wants to push through the idea of annihilation, of departure from the choice which the October revolution has made. This is speculation. This is speculation. To whose advantage is this? To whose advantage is this? I think that it is advantageous to those to whom democracy, to whom peope's activity, the new soviets, the corps of deputies with such great enthusiasm, initiatives, is not advantageous, not advantageous [sentence as heard]. But that is how we have conceived it, to get away from all this, from this administrative command system, nomenklatura and everything that is connected with it, and to involve all sections of the population—through the processes of democratization—in resolving these questions.

It is in this context, too, of course, that one must appraise the processes that are occurring in the USSR Armed Forces. They—the Army and the Armed Forces—cannot be isolated from society. That is perfectly obvious.

That is the first thing. Second—it is not simply a matter of this, of what I have been saying, that one can somehow artificially partition the Armed Forces from society. This is an insoluble task. But it is not just a question of this, but also of the fact that—in the framework of the improvement in the international situation, and the process of disarmament which is gathering force—the situation is changing, and we have arrived at a new military doctrine, on the basis of which one must carry out a reform of the USSR Armed Forces. It is about this, too. But this is also connected with the fact that we are developing our economy to the benefit of the individual and moving away from the militarized nature of the economy.

I have to say that the way the situation has developed in our economy has to a considerable extent been simply too much to bear; our economy has become overloaded in this respect. Just look: Only 10 percent of production assets have been employed in the light and food industries. So the question arises: How, in such a distorted and deformed economy, can one tackle the problems of improving living conditions, which do not suit any of us? You ask anyone who is present in this hall today.

The United States, which has more than twice the gross national product that we have, cannot and has not been able to contain the increase which was imposed upon it by the previous administration, and has now found itself, from the viewpoint of domestic debt, in two trillion [dollars'] debt, and from the viewpoint of foreign debt, I believe it is something like over $300 billion. Even this economy cannot take it.

You and I have ensured a strategic parity by drawing upon our own potential, but this means that we have taken this potential from other spheres. Therefore to continue the policy that existed in the arms race, with the stockpiling of even more weapons which—never mind when—would be put to use, even if you and I were entirely opposed to them, it would be a hopeless, an historic impasse.

On the other hand, this has exhausted even these two equal states.

There the standard of living is on a par with certain standards, while in our country it is on a level with completely different ones. So from that point of view, too, we must resolutely conduct a policy of preserving peace under conditions of disarmament and detente, and on the basis of...[pause] realizing the concept of the movement toward a nuclear [as heard] and nonviolent world.

So what are we? Idealists? What are we doing? Are we dealing with utopias? No, comrades. One cannot regard the whole world as a utopia. All the peoples, the whole generation of political leaders, have come to the conclusion that it is necessary to divert international relations into a new channel. It is necessary to cooperate. We are all vulnerable. We are confronting ecology and the depletion of resources. These problems are arising acutely everywhere. So can one, in that case, squander and oppose one another, instead of combining our efforts and tackling problems by cooperating? An enormous turn is on the way. So it is a fact that we are conducting perestroyka. We need it. The world needs it, too. Everything that affects our Army, too, is taking place in this connection, in this context, of course. Many comrades here, though, have asked sharp questions about the position of the Armed Forces, about the prestige of officers and servicemen. What is the point of evading that direct posing of the question, as it were? Someone said, to a murmur of approval, that in general we must ask the president whether the Army is needed by the country, the president, the government, and so on. [sounds of protest]

As you see, I have been listening to all that you have said. It seemed to me that we have clarity in this matter. But if such a question is being asked by you, by people who represent the Armed Forces of the whole of our country, then I must, on behalf of the Supreme Soviet, on behalf of the president and the government—and I am certain that this is the opinion of the overwhelming majority of our people—we must, this vast country, possess a modern, efficient Army, a powerful Armed Forces, that would guarantee reliable security commensurate with the present position and state of affairs in the world. If the situation alters in a differnt direction, then the Army will alter, too.

But the Army today is a most important state instrument. If any of you have any doubts or anxieties on this count, they should be cast aside. One can talk, comrades, of problems. One can speak of difficulties. One can talk about the aggravation of interethnic relations in society, the complication in the market, in the consumer market. That has affected the Army, of course, and I personally take all those remarks, for anyone who carries arms—anyone who goes by order of the state to any part of this vast country and keeps, performs, his service duty, his military duty, his sacred duty—must be guaranteed by that state and society, and you are right to raise that question.

But you should not suspect that the government, much less the president, has conceived ideas of inflicting... [changes thought] of destroying this institution. No one will permit this, our people will not permit it, and I believe that will act correctly if anyone should make an attempt on the Army. A government that does not understand the significance of the Armed Forces, and that does not take care of them has no right to exist.

For this reason... [applause], yes, for this reason we will reform our Armed Forces, taking into account the context that I mentioned. But I can see that the first stages in the implementation of the treaties on reductions in the Armed Forces—first the medium-range missiles, and now unilateral reductions—have shown us that this is a very serious matter. It affects both the Armed Forces and the defense sector of the economy, in which the best forces of the working class, designers, and scientists, are concentrated. All this requires very well balanced, well-thought-out steps.

If you say we have successfully envisaged everything in advance—to the question of how successfully we have envisaged everything in advance—I will reply in the following manner. Since the first stage of these actions, we have received certain lessons and signals, and we are drawing conclusions in government spheres, not to mention the Ministry of Defense. In this connection the need has emerged, comrades, to draw up many legislative acts: the reform itself, the law on conversion, a number of laws on defense, on the protection—the social protection—of servicemen, and so forth and so on. All these documents are being drawn up. It is precisely this that also indicates that we are taking in everything coming from the Armed Forces, from the military sector of the economy, so as to act in a better thought-out, more responsible manner.

Army Asks for Help in Relations With Republics

PM1311161790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by N. Burbyga and I. Demchenko: "Army Asks President for Protection"]

[Text] On 13 November, people's deputies from the Armed Forces met with the USSR president in the Central Theater of the Soviet Army.

As the USSR defense minister told the USSR president, 1,100 deputies from soviets of various levels were attending the meeting. The servicemen are active in legislative organs on the territory of all the republics without exception.

Despite the bold statement by the first speaker, A. Dubinin, a squadron commander and deputy of Tiraspol City Soviet, on the indestructibility of the unity of the people and the Army, his words made it clear that the Armed Forces need urgent help. Each speaker—and the floor was given to Armed Forces deputies from various

republics—considered it his duty to inform M. Gorbachev about the attacks on the Army from the leadership of the republics, the public, and the mass media. Servicemen's nerves, speakers said, are strained to the limit. In this connection there were demands to the country's leadership to act in defense of the Army. Otherwise, it was repeated from the rostrum a number of times, the Army will be forced to do this for itself. Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic People's Deputy V. Kostin, rayon military commissar from Riga, suggested to the USSR president that it finally be established whether he, the Union government, and the Soviet people need the Army. The Armed Forces, he stressed, have found themselves trapped because of contradictions between central and republic legislation.

V. Lopatin, deputy chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Committee for public security and cooperation with the USSR Ministry of Defense and the USSR KGB, stated during the meeting that on 12 November the RSFSR Council of Ministers adopted a resolution on reducing the Armed Forces on the republic's territory.

It is expected that USSR President M. Gorbachev will address the conference.

Akhromeyev Asserts Army's Defense of Constitution

PM1311165390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Nov 90 First Edition p 6

["Polemical remarks" by Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev: "Who Is Being Obstructed by the Generals"]

[Text] An increasingly broad and sharp political struggle is being waged in our society. New political parties and movements are taking organizational shape. Nationalistically inclined elements are steadily destabilizing [rasshatyvat] the state's federative structure. Separatists go further still, striving to dismember the country. Those who find its socialist nature unsuitable are consolidating themselves. These forces' actions have become increasingly aggressive recently, and they have launched a struggle for power in the country. Their fire is targeted on the most important institutions of state. The Armed Forces have also come under fierce fire. Who needs this, and why?

For more than two years now I have engaged in polemics with the journal OGONEK which, starting in 1988, headed a campaign aimed at undermining the Army's and Navy's combat readiness, a campaign based on a fabrication about the possibility of a "military coup" taking place.

This subject has also been taken up by other publications. A. Nuykin has yet again pondered the likelihood of a military coup in the Soviet Union (MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI No. 37). And USSR People's Deputy V. Martirosyan voices his "anxiety" in an article entitled "To Prevent the Military Clique from Capturing Power." The list can be extended. But this is not the main point.

Even weightier figures have now started talking about the threat of a military coup: On 4 July the newspaper KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA published a letter from People's Deputies G.A. Arbatov, Yu.A. Ryzhov, and several others. The letter says that following the Russian Communist Party congress... "The country's progressive public has been left with the feeling that dictatorship is knocking on our door." And the letter's authors go on to declare: "Gravely concerned, we would like to draw attention to the fact that repeated use of the Army for unconstitutional purposes raises a serious question: 'On whose side will it stand if fresh collisions were to develop in society? Where will it be led by the generals who value their great privileges and their power which is unlimited by the law?'"

The letter from Academicians G.A. Arbatov, Yu.A. Ryzhov, and several others is a kind of program, a general line aimed at discrediting the Soviet Army and Navy. It concentrates everything that had been hinted at before in numerous journals and newspapers.

We are familiar with Academicians Arbatov and Ryzhov—famous people, scientists, and politicians. Academician Ryzhov is now, for all intents and purposes, one of the "Democratic Platform" leaders. Everything is clear as regards Yu.A. Ryzhov's political position. Academician Arbatov writes extensively in the press, mainly on military-political questions and the building of the USSR Armed Forces. He essentially heads the anti-Army campaign in the country but he does not reveal his political position, nor does he express his attitude toward the Program Declaration "Toward Humane, Democratic Socialism" adopted by the 28th CPSU Congress. But in his desire to split the generals' and officers' corps, to present the generals in an adverse light before the Soviet people, and thus to weaken the Armed Forces, G.A. Arbatov unwillingly—if only partially—reveals his political views.

Let us examine the letter's contents in detail.

Let me say at once that I disagree with the authors' opinion that the Army was supposedly used for unconstitutional purposes in 1988-1990. Our Army has never operated willfully or autonomously [samovolno ili samostoyatelno] anywhere, since 1945 through 1985, and since 1985 to this day. It has always fulfilled only decisions by the state's leadership—the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR president. All these state and party organs were at the time or are today the constitutional organs of power. If academicians Arbatov and Ryzhov have any complaints against the state leadership for what they consider illegal use of the Army and Navy, they ought to

submit these claims to the proper quarters, not to wrongfully accuse the Army. But they submit charges against the Army. Why? So as to sow mistrust in the Armed Forces among the people.

The letter speaks of "generals who value their great privileges and their power which is unlimited by the law." This is a deliberate and downright untruth.

It makes sense to try to figure out who these generals and admirals are, what are they doing, and how prepared are they to perform the tasks assigned to them?

As of 1 October 1990, the USSR Armed Forces have a total of 1,991 serving marshals, generals, and admirals (incidentally, the U.S. Armed Forces have 1,591 serving generals and admirals today).

What sort of people are they, these generals and admirals? According to social origins they are, as a rule, offspring of workers' and peasants' families. This is how the generals' corps (at division commander level) is made up: 48 percent percent come from the workers, 14 percent from the peasants, 26 percent from the intelligentsia, and 17 percent from servicemen's families.

The salary of the majority of generals and admirals is 700-750 rubles [R], or R150-200 more than a colonel's salary.

The generals do not enjoy any "great privileges"; this is the product of a fertile imagination. After all, the academicians' letter does not name a single specific privilege. I would say that it is simply improper to conduct polemics using such methods. Quite a few fairy tales have been composed about dachas used by generals and admirals. Clarity must be introduced. The government has abolished all privileges as regards payment for the use of dachas. Now each and every general who rents a state dacha pays the full rental. There are about 160 persons living in such dachas.

Let us also take a closer look at the letter's claim about the "possibility of fresh collisions developing in society." A vague and camouflaged statement. Why not state bluntly what specific collisions are the topic of the letter? Evidently, the authors are not too willing to reveal the content of such collisions. To put it bluntly, in my view they are talking about the possible liquidation of the socialist social system in our country and its replacement by a capitalist system.

I have no need to conceal my position. I express it openly. I am a champion of the socialist way of life and deem it mandatory to work within the framework of the USSR Constitution in order to fulfill the 28th CPSU Congress decisions on the building of humane and democratic socialism and strive for their implementation. I think that such ideological positions are held by the majority of generals and admirals.

But at the same time I also recognize something else. We now have a multiparty society. In accordance with the USSR Constitution, the political struggle for influence in society—and ultimately for power—waged by the party by constitutional means, is legitimate. And if some party, other than the Communist Party, were to gain electoral victory in the course of this struggle, the Armed Forces will accept this. They have been and are being educated in, and act with, respect for our Constitution, the Congress of People's Deputies, and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

But something else must also be clear. If the Constitution were to be infringed and someone (be it separatists or some other antisocialist associations) were to try to use force or any other anticonstitutional actions to dismember our country or change its social system, the Armed Forces—by decision of the Supreme Soviet and the USSR president—could be used to ensure the unity of our motherland and preserve its social structure in accordance with the Constitution.

I think we have gotten to the main point. It is precisely this position on the generals' part that resulted in a campaign being organized and conducted and, recently, in command personnel being literally hounded. Because the generals and admirals lead the Army and Navy, which are among the main guarantors of our country's peaceful development and are therefore obstructing those who wish to destabilize our federative socialist system.

The magazine OGONEK has also added an attack on the military oath to all the untruths that it has previously published about the Army and Navy. This is what the magazine preaches: "The military oath... indicates the inescapability of punishment for treachery. Treachery against whom and what? In the light of the new thinking and the priority of general human over class interests and in the context of planetary thinking, unthinking and unconditional devotion to solely the interests of the motherland becomes a narrow-minded approach to the idea of the survival of the human race." There you have it. Nothing less than that. An oath is considered essential in the armies of all the world's states, but for the Soviet Armed Forces it has become obsolete, in OGONEK's view.

To what lengths can people go in denigrating the traditions that our people have built up over centuries of defending their fatherland?

In the magazine's view, a servicemen's oath to be prepared to defend his mother and father, his wife and children, and the entire Soviet people, his "unconditional devotion... to the interests of the motherland," is a narrow-minded approach. Where do you go from here?

The destabilization of the Armed Forces today involves not just wholesale unjustified criticism and even lies. Our society has recently learned of yet another extremely dubious, to put it mildly, theory aimed by no means at strengthening our Armed Forces. It is called the "New Concept for the Country's Security System." It was first proposed by a group of academics and subsequently published by USSR People's Deputies Yu.A. Ryzhov

(the de facto author of the theory) and V.N. Lopatin. Since I had occasion to be concerned with questions relating to the country's security on a professional basis for a number of years I will express my opinion. I talk about a theory rather than a concept because a concept for the country's security system must presuppose as a minimum the elucidation of the content (in an Armed Forces context) of at least four questions constituting the substance of the improvement of the Army and Navy. First—what the degree of war danger to the country is at the present time and what armed forces we need in this connection. Second—what the structure of the Armed Forces should be. Third—how they should be manned. Fourth—how the training and education of Army and Navy personnel should be organized. But much of this is absent from Yu.A. Ryzhov's concept. So what we have at this stage is not a concept but theoretical propositions.

What strikes one in this theory?

It combines the individual security of the citizen (the defense of his life, property, and basic rights) with the security of the state (the defense of the country's sovereignty and territorial integrity and of the inviolability of its borders and the constitutional system and the defense of the state interests of the country and of the interests of its citizens abroad). There can be no objection to this comprehensive approach when big statewide problems are being examined—for example, the improvement of the state and social system with a view to maintaining the country's unity; the improvement of the system of state administration; the augmentation of economic and defense might. In these cases these most important problems do indeed need to be examined as a package. They are all linked by the interest that the people and the state have in their positive solution. They must be the province of the Congress of People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR president.

But at the same time the practical activity of supreme organs of state power also involves not only the examination of major tasks as a package but also the solution of major specific problems. A citizen's security is an integral part of his civil rights. The problem of human rights is enormous in itself, and it needs to be regulated by a whole range of laws and resolutions. Another major problem is the state's security, and part of this is the country's defense capability. And the problem of improving the Armed Forces is part of defense capability.

And it is very doubtful that all these questions need to be squeezed together into a single concept, that is, a single problem.

The concern that Yu.A. Ryzhov and V.N. Lopatin feel for the internal situation in the country is understandable, and I share it. It is something that needs to be tackled within the state. But in view of the complex internal situation in the country, the problem of the country's defense capability must not be locked into a complete package of other problems. That way it is not far to leaving the country defenseless. On the contrary, the Army today needs the assistance of the people, the assistance of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR president himself. In the process military and expenditure can and must be cut today (and I am also in agreement with this).

I would like to express my view on one other question. In connection with the ever broadening anti-Army campaign, which sometimes assumes a hysterical nature, military leaders are not always given the correct advice when they ask state and party bodies for assistance.

The first recommendation is that the state and party leadership should not intervene in the polemic that has developed around military problems. Since it affects the Army and Navy, let the military and journalists get on with it. I have always regarded that attitude as a mistake. Today it has become simply harmful. Self-styled journalists (but in fact antisocialist forces and specific major public figures representing them) run no risk in fueling anti-Army hysteria. At present they are invulnerable. But they are doing their wicked work. They have many newspapers, magazines, and television programs in their hands—a vast propaganda apparatus created out of the people's money but in this cased being used against the people's interests. Whereas we military leaders have incomparably fewer mass media and our opportunities for addressing the public are limited.

It is wrong to abandon the Army and Navy—which by their very nature are not designed for waging an ideological struggle in the press, radio, and television—to single combat with antisocialist forces and professionals in this business.

To sum up I would like to say that the attacks on generals and even the anti-Army campaign as a whole might seem to be tangential questions of our life. But in fact they have ceased to be tangential since mid-1990. Since then the separatists' and antisocialist forces' policy of discrediting the Armed Forces has merged with the discrediting of the Communist Party and attempts to force it onto the margins of society. Starting at the same time there have been the mass campaign against the USSR Government in the press and demands at meetings, in television broadcasts, and in the press for its resignation. The summer of 1990 saw the start of a unified offensive by destructive forces against Unionwide state and social structures. This also signaled the start of an offensive against our federative state, with a view to dismembering it, and against our socialist system, with a view to eliminating it. The only people who cannot see this today are people who do not wish to.

The time has come for our federative socialist state, the cause of our life, and the future of our children to be actively and resolutely defended within the framework of our constitution.

Problems With Fall Draft in Belorussia Detailed

91UM0091A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Nov 90 First Edition p 4

[Article by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Colonel A. Smolyanko: "Who Is Responsible for the Draft—Report From the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers and Other Places"]

[Text] I climbed to the sixth floor in the imposing gray building. Here I became acquainted with I. Nedelyay, chief of the department of administrative organs. I cite only a small fragment of our conversation.

"Ivan Sergeyevich, this is the first time that this year's Army draft is being conducted not by order of the Ministry of Defense, but in accordance with a decree of the USSR Council of Ministers. What has been done to implement it in a qualitative and timely way?"

"We did not prepare a special plan, and there is no need for one. We maintain close contact with the military district and the military commissariats...."

"Surely there are people in the Council of Ministers who handle draft questions?"

"There was such a person until not long ago, and his work had a positive effect. Recently, this position, in fact, was abolished...."

That was the conversation. That is why, I must confess, further words did not convince me that, as they said, there was no reason for concern, inasmuch as the draft is proceeding normally, and no critical problems are emerging. A discordant note in this calmness could also be sensed in Ivan Sergeyevich's statement that not long ago the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] adopted an address to the citizen's of the republic with an appeal not to permit a disruption in this important state campaign and not to be influenced by those who are trying to drive a wedge between the Army and the people. Similar addresses, it is apropos to say, were also adopted by some veterans' organizations and labor collectives.

And so, having failed to clarify the real contribution of the Council of Ministers to the organization of the draft, I headed for the oblast draft center, which was located about a 10-minute walk away. Here the calm turned into a gale. The building, in fact, was blocked by numerous parents and friends of the draftees. Colonel A. Levchenko, the chief of the center, after learning what I was interested in, said frankly:

"I did not see representatives of the government for the many years that I served here. Lower ranking chiefs came here, heard me out, looked around, sympathized, and then their mission ended. And we were left one on one with our problems, of which there were many and that we could not handle by ourselves."

"Look," Levchenko led me to the window, "see how many people are forcing their way into our building. I asked the authorities to set aside some kind of a hall or room for the visitors, or at least to set up benches in the little public garden.... All in vain. I sent several letters to different offices to install two or three telephones (there is one for all of the officials). But I did not even get an answer."

Meanwhile, Major General V. Korotkov, the military commander of the republic, came out to the people, and questions and angry exclamations poured forth. It looked as if it was the general who was "taking" the boys into the Army, and not the state in accordance with the Constitution.

And then I thought: It would be good if a representative of the local Soviet authority participated in such dialogues. Let him explain to the people the essence of a military obligation and the constitutional duty of each citizen, and not put everything, as happens today, on the shoulders of district staff officers or of the military commissariats.

I am not inclined to think that the comrades in the Council of Ministers are not aware of the negative tendencies that occur during a draft call. However, as I became convinced, they do not possess complete information, and they do not have a great influence on the situation.

I was given an interesting figure in the district headquarters. Last year in Belorussia, there were 40 so-called "refuseniks," and the spring draft call this year had twice as many. What is the Council of Ministers doing so that the increase in service evasion will drop? Has a fundamental evaluation of this phenomenon been made? Alas, it has not.

That the Council of Ministers does not particularly bother itself with the work of the military commissariats is indicated by other facts. For example, by instructions of that very same republic government dated 30 October 1989, the draft center building is being transferred to the Union of Composers, whose representatives have already "occupied" the garage, and who plan to convert the rooms. But where will the officers of the military commissariat work? It is not clear, and no one seems to be troubled by this.

A new draft center is being built on the outskirts of the capital as part of a project that meets the highest modern demands. I visited there with the military commander of the republic. The picture, I will say outright, is miserable. There were only several workers here, but even they were not doing any work. Huge cranes and other equipment were standing in lonely silence. In three years, they were barely able to erect just two floors. They throw up their hands in the Council of Ministers; they say that there are no materials and workers. Of course, the republic is living through a difficult time, but why does no one make answerable those who deliver defective goods to the

building site and who plunder what is built and received here?

Incidentally, construction has come to a standstill on the oblast draft center in the city of Brest, where what was already done has been falling down for two years. There is no draft center there at all now. They are also in disastrous condition in many of the rayon military commissariats. And it is simply impossible to remove these problems through military efforts alone.

Baltic Republics

Baltic Council To Reconvene 17 November

LD1311162990 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] We learned from reliable sources that today Vytautas Landsbergis made a phone call from London to the Lithuanian Supreme Council and authorized his deputies to make arrangements so that the Council of the Baltic States will be convened again in Vilnius this Saturday to strengthen the joint stance toward the Soviets.

Baltic States Seek Recognition in CFE Treaty

PM1311112190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Nikolay Lashkevich dispatch under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Baltic Council Sitting"]

[Text] Vilnius—The position of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia on the CSCE meeting which is opening in a few days' time in Paris was expounded by representative delegations from the three republics, which gathered at an extraordinary sitting of the Baltic States Council.

The leaders of the delegation, chairmen of the republic Supreme Soviets V. Landsbergis, A. Gorbunovs, and A. Ruutel, were united in the opinion that the signing of an agreement restricting conventional weapons in Europe should promote the complete restoration of the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. A joint statement was adopted. In it, the Baltic Council specifically appeals to the CSCE countries to be sure to incorporate in that agreement an official stance regarding "nonrecognition of the annexation and consequent dissent from the neglect of the Baltic States' de jure independent status."

Earlier, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia had aimed for observer status at the Paris conference but gotten no positive response to their demands. It is difficult to say whether the three republics' latest attempt to cut a window through to Europe will be successful. Despite its assurances of assistance in the Baltic Republics' effort to obtain real autonomy, the West is in no hurry to recognize their state sovereignty.

Estonia Appeals for Treaty Mention

LD1311143590 Moscow TASS in English 1350 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn November 13 TASS—"Estonia supports the expected conclusion of a European Conventional Force Reduction (CFR) treaty," says a joint appeal adopted today by the Estonian parliament and the Committee of Estonia—an organisation which favours the restoration of the structure that existed in the republic prior to 1940.

The appeal, addressed to NATO, Warsaw Treaty and Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) countries, speaks of favourable prospects for limiting conventional arms in Europe and promoting the start of the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other countries.

A special mention of Estonia in the CFR treaty would enable it to guarantee the implementation of the treaty throughout Estonian territory on a parity basis and in cooperation with other countries, the republican parliament and the Committee on Estonia believe.

Lithuania Issues Statement on Moscow Talks

LD1311175690 Moscow TASS in English 1713 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Ustsila]

[Text] Vilnius November 13 TASS—The Lithuanian parliament and Government issued a joint statement today, accusing the Soviet Government of a desire "to suspend trade and economic agreements with the Lithuanian republic".

Today Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene briefed parliament on talks between the Soviet Government and prime ministers of three Baltic republics in Moscow on Saturday. During the talks the Soviet Government proposed that, pending the signing of a new Union treaty, the two sides should base their interaction on Soviet laws, the Soviet president's decrees and resolutions of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The statement describes the demands by the Union government as an attampt "to undermine the possibilities for normal, equal economic cooperation between the Baltic republics and the USSR".

This creates "a dangerous economic situation which can damage the economic interests of the republics and enterprises of the USSR, interested in getting required commodities from Lithuania".

Lithuania's parliament and government invited the Soviet republics and trade and economic partners located on their territories "to seal direct economic ties".

Prunskiene Address on Statement

LD1311144990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0905 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Address by Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene at a session of the Lithuanian Supreme Council held in Vilnius, with interjections by Deputy Jermolenka—live]

[Excerpts] [Prunskiene] Esteemed chairman, esteemed deputies! The interest of the Republic of Lithuania is to preserve bilaterally beneficial trade and economic links with the republics of the Soviet Union. Selling resources which are at the disposition of the central government of the Soviet Union to Lithuania, and vice versa, do not require any further argumentation. During the process of

the preparation for negotiatiions, as well as during the consultative meetings of the delegations, partial agreements had been reached concerning further work in the formation of trade and economic links for the year 1991. Accordingly, the coordination of positions among departments was taking place. The Ministry of Material Recourses of the Republic of Lithuania and other ministries and their staff spent more than a week preparing specific draft documents, including the clarification of differences, which was carried out even with relevant departments in the Soviet Union.

On 10 November an intergovernmental conference was to take place, as a result of which certain documents would be provided. The drafts of these we had prepared together with the governments of Estonia and Latvia. Indeed, we arrived at this conference with a unanimous and coordinated position. Unfortunately, the conduct of the Soviet Union Government made such agreement impossible, at least for the time being. Discussing this issue yesterday at a joint meeting of the government and the Presidium of the Supreme Council, a common point of view was reached that a statement—a joint statement by the government and the Supreme Council—should be prepared, the text of which would supplement what I have already said. At the same time I would like to propose taking a vote on it. Therefore, the government proposes the following text for the statement:

The statement of the Government and the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania concerning the position adopted by the government of the Soviet Union in suspending the trade and economic agreements with the Republic of Lithuania.

On 10 November 1990 a discussion took place in Moscow between Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian governments on the one side, and the government of the Soviet Union on the other, during which agreement was not reached concerning trade and economic links for 1991 according to drafts coordinated in advance with departments of the countries.

The government of the Soviet Union links the possibility of such agreements with the following conditions, which should be carried out by the Baltic states

First, to recognize the laws of the Soviet Union on their territories and to manage their economy, taxation, budgets, deduction of hard currency and others in compliance with these laws;

Second, deductions to the budget of the Soviet Union in 1991 should be carried out according to the norms defined by the Soviet Union;

Third, to take part in setting up a hard currency fund of the Soviet Union while adding to it about 70 percent of hard currency revenue of the republics, thus paying the state debts of the USSR. This would make it possible to receive from the Soviet Union foodstuff, manufactured commodities, medicine, and other goods purchased for hard currency through centralized channels in third states;

Fourth, to recognize the procedure of supplying the so-called enterprises of all-union subordination and their exceptional status with regard to the budget.

Having suspended the drawn-up bilateral economic and trade agreements with the Republic of Lithuania, the government of the Soviet Union has set up an absolutely new economic situation, which threatens negative consequences. At the same time it aggravates considerably the implementation of economic interests of union republics and enterprises in purchasing commodities from Lithuania.

The actions of the government of the Soviet Union reflect its uncompromising attitude toward the questions of negotiations, and perhaps its formal attitude toward the preparation for the negotiations themselves.

The government and the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania appeals to the republics of the Soviet Union and the present economic partners on their territories, and propose to make efforts for the reinforcement of direct links on the basis of equal rights and bilateral profit.

The government and the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania demand that borders open without delay to allow free economic and trade links with all countries.

By the way, I also voiced the latter points and demands during the discussion. Perhaps it would be possible here to remind you once again that the Republic of Lithuania lives in compliance of its own laws. I do not know of anywhere in the world where this is not yet clear. Therefore, because we speak about a specific fact, specific actions in suspending economic and trade links, perhaps this text is sufficient. [passage omitted]

I agree with Deputy Saulius Razma in thinking that an appeal to President Gorbachev, on whose orders the Soviet Union's delegation for negotiations with Lithuania had been set up, should be made without delay in order to clarify if, namely, such an uncompromising position, which makes the negotiations itself pointless, is also supported by him. This is a very important issue. [passage omitted]

I would also like to say that although Lavtvia adopted a more cautious stance at the meeting, and attempted to conduct the talks within the framework of the law on economic independence, which, by the way, appeared to have been suspended for us until 1 July of next year on the decree of the president, later, after the meeting, the Latvian prime minister, Godmanis, informed me that he supported my position and that all further actions we should carry out adequately.

Therefore, there is a serious crisis in the relations between the governments of the Baltic states and of the Soviet Union.

[Jermolenka] Esteemed Prime Minister, although you have already partly answered my question I wanted to ask you: After the Lithuanian delegation left, did the Latvian and Estonian delegations remain for long?

[Prunskiene] No, no

[Jermolenka] Did they win anything there?

[Prunskiene] I apologize to everyone who was somewhat misled by the television. I do not know where they heard that the Estonian delegation also remained. We had been talking for three hours, from 0700 until 1000, when it became clear that there was no more to talk about. I was the first to say that in fact there was nothing to talk about. You probably know what our parting was like. I would not say it was entirely fit and proper or entirely polite and ethical. However, never mind this; the representatives of Latvia left for a short while. However, because the USSR Government had said earlier that there was something that could be discussed with the Latvians, they maintained a different position. The Latvians raised hopes of reaching an agreement in compliance with the law on economic independence and to coordinate the demands with the possibilities of carrying them out [words indistinct]. It was proposed to them to proceed with negotiations. They left for a short while and then returned. Of course, we hinted during our farewell that as we understand it the Latvians have decided to remain in the union.

However, the telephone call from Prime Minister Godmanis somewhat reassured me in a sense, when, as a government leader, he said that (?their stand) essentially corresponds to that of ours.

So, I did not ask what the Latvians had gained. In general it was not likely to win anything. Besides, according to the prime minister, in such a case the Latvian delegation was not authorized to proceed until some agreement had been reached. The delegation comprised only his deputy and the minister of economy. Therefore, the agreement in fact had not been concluded. Probably other variants of the agreement were discussed according to the scenario which I have described, i.e., within the framework of the implementation of the law on economic independence.

Poll Measures Lithuanian Leaders' Popularity

LD1311204790 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Excerpts] If we are to believe TASS reports from Vilnius, the upper crust of the CPSU organization in Lithuania has made its activities more vigorous. The leaders of this organization have met leaders of the lower units of the CPSU Salcininkai organization. Those gathered urged each other on to a more resolute campaign against manifestations of totalitarianism in Soviet Lithuania. The question of increasing party influence in economics was acutely raised.

Having rightly pointed out the disastrous nature of the law on political parties adopted by the Republic of Lithuania, the CPSU organization in Lithuania stated that people were concerned because adequate reaction to this law has not yet been voiced from the center. The CPSU Politburo and the president of the Soviet Union should take a clear stand on this issue, said the activists of the CPSU organization. [passage omitted]

We have just learned today about the popularity of some political forces in Lithuania. The CPSU organization can expect the support of only 12 percent of the population: 81 percent oppose it. So this is what is meant by representing the people.

The Lithuanian Liberty League is supported by 32 percent with 58 percent opposed. The Lithuanian Communist Party garners 53 percent for and 28 percent against. The popularity of the Lithuanian Sajudis and other political parties was not polled. [passage omitted]

The opinion poll, conducted in October, indicated that the people of Lithuania think that K. Prunskiene best represents the interests of the country. This is the opinion of 57 percent, down from 61 percent in June. Second place was taken by V.L. Landsbergis at 38 percent, up 10 percent. In third place at 35 percent, 15 percent down, was Algirdas Brazauskas.

Lithuania To Issue Passports for Foreign Travel

PM1311111790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by Nikolay Lashkevich under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Own Passport in Lithuania"]

[Text] Vilnius—The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has approved regulations on the Lithuanian republic citizen's passport.

Henceforth, by decision of the Lithuanian legislature, the general USSR citizen's passport will begin to be replaced by the Lithuanian citizen's passport. This was first tried last April, when the Law on the Lithuanian Republic citizen's identity card was issued. However, this document certified a person's citizenship more than his identity and therefore was of limited potential. It is no coincidence that only a small number of people exercised the right to obtain such an identity card.

Externally the new Lithuanian citizen's passport corresponds to all world examples and international standards. It is intended to be used abroad—in those countries which recognize the Lithuanian state. Nationality is not entered in the passport even though Lithuania has firm linguistic norms for transcribing surnames from Russian into Lithuanian. It is likely that a special language commission will eventually decide how non-Lithuanian surnames should be entered in the document.

The forthcoming issue of passports to the population raises one quite delicate problem. When receiving a Lithuanian passport and swearing loyalty to Lithuania, the citizen should from moral considerations first of all give up USSR citizenship and accordingly the Soviet passport. Which means that if other states do not recognize Lithuania's independence he will not be able to travel abroad.

CSFR Envoy Clarifies Accord With Lithuania

PM1311154590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Nov 90 Union Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "About Consultations Between Representatives of the CSFR and Lithuania"]

[Text] IZVESTIYA No 305 carried information based on a REUTER report about consultations held in Prague between CSFR First Deputy Foreign Minister Garencar and Lithuanian Deputy Foreign Minister Grizas, the result of which, it was indicated, was an agreement on the creation of "diplomatic missions in the sides' capitals."

As a representative of the CSFR Embassy in Moscow reported to IZVESTIYA's editorial office, the news report contains a material inaccuracy. The consultations in Prague had the aim of preparing a protocol on the opening in Prague and Vilnius of interest bureaus—missions not having diplomatic status. It is envisaged that these bureaus will be concerned with questions of developing friendly relations and cooperation between the CSFR and Lithuania in the spheres of economics, science, culture, education, and tourism. They will also be concerned with studying domestic policy development and briefing the corresponding foreign policy organizations on this question. In addition, it is proposed to give the bureaus the task of looking after the interests of economic entities having various forms of ownership on both countries' territories during the realization of economic and scientific-technical cooperation between them.

A protocol setting up the interest bureaus is due to be signed by the CSFR and Lithuanian foreign ministers.

'Intolerance' Shown in Vilnius 7 Nov Deplored

PM1311122390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[N. Lashkevich report under "IZVESTIYA Correspondents on Events in the Country" rubric: "Lithuania: The Lessons of 7 November"]

[Text] Vilnius—The incidents that occurred during the 7 November military parade and festive procession forced deputies to return to the events on Gediminas Avenue the next day at an evening sitting of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

Even though no serious incidents were observed in the city, certain conflicts, so it emerged in the course of the deputies' investigation, could have negative consequences, especially in the sphere of interethnic relations. M. Misiukonis, Lithuanian minister of internal affairs, informed the legislators that criminal proceedings have been instituted against certain civilians who started brawls in the city streets and that an investigation is being conducted.

The most dangerous center of tension occurred in the conservatory building, whose windows look out onto the avenue and former Lenin Square. As a result of a clash between paratroops and students, and also regional defense department personnel who were in the conservatory building, four people were injured and sought medical assistance. Speaking at the sitting A. Butkevicius, director general of the regional defense department, as expected placed sole responsibility for this occurrence on the paratroops.

However, many questions associated with this and other incidents just did not get a specific answer. Who was the instigator of the conflict at the conservatory? Is the guarding of higher educational establishments part of the department's function? Did its staff know of the intentions of the students who played out a parody of two Soviet leaders greeting the demonstration on the conservatory balcony? Were all these activities not a preplanned action?

A special republic Supreme Soviet statement adopted at the sitting maintained a harsh tone. It protested against "the demonstration of military force and its use in Lithuania." The USSR and its Armed Forces are accused of grave human rights violations.

Of course, the celebration of the October anniversary in Vilnius did not promote interethnic harmony. Perhaps for the first time I saw with my own eyes and so vividly, alas, the overt confrontation between the peoples living in Lithuania. The cries of "Occupiers!" and "Ivan Go Home!" on the one hand; of "Separatists!" and "Fascists!" on the other. Threatening fists from house balconies and the sidewalk and retaliatory gestures from the column of demonstrators, the throwing of coins at people—to help you migrants on your way, they say... Yes, there were no serious incidents, but the energy of intolerance is gradually building up, threatening an explosion. Everyone must remember this. The lessons of the graphically manifested confrontation in Vilnius urge everyone to show tolerance. Tolerance of dissent, of another nation. Otherwise the troubles will not pass.

Burokevicius Appeals Against Monument Destruction

LD1011180290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1055 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Text] Vilnius, 10 Nov (TASS)—In connection with the dismantling of a monument to V. Mickiavicius-Kapsukas, Mikolas Burokevicius, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania (CPSU), has made a radio appeal to the citizens of the republic.

The appeal says that Kapsukas was an outstanding son of the Lithuanian people. Not only was he one of the founders of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the Lithuanian Soviet Republic, he was also an eminent figure in the international communist and workers' movements, a current affairs expert, historian, and literary critic.

The leadership of Lithuanian and Vilnius' self-government, stressed M. Burokevicius, are continuing to destroy cultural monuments. The interests of the Lithuanian people are alien to them. They are concerned with reviving the bourgeois regime of the Black Hundreds in Lithuania. At this moment Lithuanian culture, literature, art, and science are in danger, and for this reason the Communists of Lithuania call upon all residents of the republic to protest against the destruction of historical and cultural monuments in Lithuania.

Lithuanian Poles' Autonomy Moves Explained

PM1411085590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy Anitset Petrovich Brodavskiy, chairman of Vilnyusskiy Rayon Soviet, by PRAVDA correspondent Yu. Stroganov; place, date not given; under the "Situation" rubric: "Are They Playing the 'Polish Card'?"]

[Text] A month has elapsed since the congress of deputies of various levels from the Vilnius region in Ejsiskes City, but this event is still being vigorously discussed in the republic, and even eyewitnesses have given conflicting assessments of it.

The topic of relations between the residents of the rayons situated around Vilnius with the "rest" of Lithuania is an extremely delicate one altogether. I asked one of the active participants in the event—USSR People's Deputy A. Brodavskiy, chairman of Vilnyusskiy Rayon Soviet—to explain what happened in Ejsiskes.

[Brodavskiy] The congress unanimously adopted a declaration on the creation of a Polish national-territorial region with its own status within Lithuania. Wilenszczyzna, for short. It comprises the areas with a dense Polish population. In Vilnyusskiy Rayon, for instance, 67 and 20 percent of the population are Poles and Lithuanians respectively, while 82 percent of Shalchininksiy Rayon's population are Poles. But we are not violating the rights of people of other nationalities. Thus, our rayon has formed a council of representatives of the national minorities. The population's interests in all spheres are represented by citizens elected or appointed on the basis of proportional and equal representation of national minorities. We have established trilingualism on our territory: The Polish language in conjunction with Lithuanian is the state language, while Russian is the language for interethnic communication. Admittedly, the Lithuanian parliament deemed these decisions to be unlawful...

[Stroganov] What do you think about the often-heard accusations that the Ejsiskes congress was orchestrated by Moscow and the CPSU?

[Brodavskiy] What bearing can they have on this when the process is rooted deep in history? In my view, if anyone is playing the "Polish card," it is primarily the leaders of influential political groups within the Lithuanian parliament itself. We have nothing against the Lithuanians' right to self-determination. There is little point in recalling old insults which are difficult to grasp from today's vantage point. But this is our land, we were born here. We are only striving to restore moral justice, which was violated as a result of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact. Many of its consequences have been discussed very frequently over the last few years, yet the fact that one of these consequences was the annexation of Wilno and the Wilno region to Lithuania is hushed up. Different political realities have, of course, arisen over the last 50 years. We have grown into the structure of the republic, so to speak. However, significant changes are once again taking place in Lithuania and the opinion of the region's inhabitants is once again not being considered.

[Stroganov] Nonetheless, should the declaration have been announced in view of these very realities and in the knowledge of the touchy attitude to events in these areas which are verging on confrontation? Especially since the republic's leadership is promising to devote considerable attention to the problems of Lithuania's Poles. It is promising to develop cultural autonomous formations and implement reforms helping to enshrine guarantees of self-expression for Lithuania's national communities.

[Brodavskiy] We have had all this before... The steps taken since the adoption of the 11 March act on Lithuanian independence particularly prompted caution. There is also talk about a mandatory switch to Lithuanian as the state language without consideration for the trilingualism that has taken shape in our rayons, changes in the public education system associated with the introduction of the concept of national schooling, and of much else. Our population fell to thinking: What kind of Lithuanian state will result? Will it guarantee human rights, irrespective of nationality, origins, and so on? Bitter historical experience has taught the region's inhabitants something and prompted quests for a mechanism to protect their vital interests. The recent ideas of the integration of southeast Lithuania also promoted this—this essentially boils down to the territorial partition of the so-called Polish-speaking areas. That is why the Vilnius region began to formulate options for an autonomous national-territorial unit. But we must not forget that our homeland is here in Lithuania. We held a congress of deputies of various levels—from the lowest level to the Supreme Soviet—1 June this year. It elected a coordinating council, which was tasked with formulating documents regarding the creation of an autonomous national-territorial unit. The congress continued its work in Ejsiskes and adopted the declaration. We

asked the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet to back us and make the appropriate changes to the republic's Fundamental Law.

[Stroganov] How do you see the region's relations with Lithuania, with the USSR?

[Brodavskiy] I think that in relations with the republic we must represent components of the federation with our own territory, organs of power, and constitution, without contravening the constitution of the entire federation. I am sure that all processes cannot be managed from the center today: The country is too great. What is needed is maximum independence for the individual regions.

Latvia Drafting Bill on Protecting Borders

LD1211122290 Moscow TASS in English 1159 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga November 12 TASS—Latvia will need approximately 6-8 million rubles a year to guard its borders, the authors of a bill on the republic's state border told journalists. Deputies to the republican parliament intend to discuss the bill early this week.

Guarding air space, which requires a lot of sophisticated equipment, will prove very costly. Therefore it is planned to begin by demarcating land borders and recognising a 12-mile zone of Latvia's territorial waters.

This law would regulate the border status: A border crossing procedure, rules for calls by ships, overflight regulations, the duties of the Border Guard servide and many other things.

The existence of such norms is a must for any sovereign state and is essential for successful anti-crime action, the authors of the bill said.

A territorial issue concerning Russia's Pytalovo region, given to Latvia in 1920 and returned to Russia in 1944, has already been raised in Latvia. The Baltic republic intends to seek the return of the region at an intergovernmental level.

However, the authors of the bill pointed out, during talks with the Russian Federation Pytalovo would most probably be a trump card to compel the other side to make compromises and concessions in various spheres.

Latvia has suggested that Russia and Byelorussia set up special commissions to discuss the question of borders, but there has been no reply.

Latvia Planning Realignment

LD1411121590 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 14 Nov 90

[INTERFAX report from the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] It is planned to have the state border of the Latvian Republic established as early as next year. This was stated at a Riga news conference by deputies of the national legislature, who are working on a draft law on the state border of the republic. It is thought that the border will be in keeping with the outline of the Latvian borders which existed prior to 16 June 1940. In accordance with this draft, the settlement of Pytalkovo—its former Latvian name is Abrene—should be annexed from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and given to Latvia.

The deputies state that they intend to resolve conflicts that may arise during the Latvian border being established through negotiations. An INTERFAX correspondent reports that a special department of the Latvian Council of Ministers will be responsible for order along the border. The department will subsequently be turned into a republican Ministry of State Security. The full restoration of the state border will cost Latvia between 6 million and 8 million rubles.

Jurvala Gorkom, City Officials Clash Over Office

LD1211212690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1755 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga, 12 Nov (TASS)—Gennadiy Shchukin, first secretary of the Jurmala city committee [gorkom] of the Latvian Communist Party, called an attempt to evict the gorkom from its own office arbitrary.

Making a speech at a news conference today, he reported that on 9 November a group of about 20 people, deputy chairman of the city executive committee among them, tried to smash the doors and remove belongings of the city committee of the Latvian Communist Party.

As Gennadiy Shchukin said, this act violated all existing legal rules. Only the intervention of a militia special purpose detachment and airborne assault servicemen helped to restore order.

The conflict between the executive committee of the city soviet and the party city committee over offices has been going on for about six months, and Shchukin's statement says it is of a "clear-cut political nature."

The building housing the town party committee and the town executive committee was built on an order from the Directorate of Affairs of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and was partly financed by the party budget. All expenses for the upkeep of the gorkom offices and the guarding of the entire building were taken from party funds.

Nevertheless, the republican state arbitration court upheld the suit of the Jurmala town executive committee for evicting the gorkom from the premises it occupies. In turn, the USSR Arbitration Court quashed the decision of the subordinate body, but since the local bodies of power have declared republican legislation's priority over the union

one, it will be very difficult to ensure the implementation of the union court of arbitration's decision.

Gennadiy Shchukin says that after the 9 November incident the gorkom addressed the procuracy with a demand to institute criminal proceedings concerning the case of official arbitrariness. As for the special purpose militia detachment, Shchukin says it acted in line with the USSR president's decree "On Measures for Protecting the Inviolability of the Right of Ownership in the USSR."

Paper Views Clash

PM1211205390 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 13 Nov 90 p 2

[Correspondent A. Timkov report under "Political Crossroads" rubric: "One Step Away From Bloodshed"]

[Text] Riga, 12 Nov—The events which have unfolded around Jurmala Latvian Communist Party City Committee have received different interpretations in the republic's press. Directly opposing viewpoints, unfortunately, are not conducive to the search for the truth but encourage an unpredictable outcome. The nub of the conflict is that the republic's judicial authorities ruled that the gorkom be evicted from the premises it occupies. The USSR State Arbitration Commission revoked that ruling on the grounds that the building was constructed using party resources.

Matters should be investigated calmly here, acting solely in accordance with the law. However, union legislation, including the USSR president's decrees, have been ignored since the adoption of the declaration on the restoration of statehood in Lithuania. That is why Jurmala City Soviet Executive Committee, which lays claim to the premises, decided to evict the party gorkom from the building. To this end they enlisted the marshal of the court, workers of the city militia and municipal police, and loaders, who were to remove furniture and carry out the expropriation.

Acting on the USSR State Arbitration Commission's decision, party gorkom officials asked the special purpose militia detachment for help and halted the removal of the property. After the loaders had fled the police carried the property back at the demand of the special purpose militia detachment.

According to a Latvian news agency correspondent's report, the "black berets" beat up the loaders and others who were in the building and one of the victims was hospitalized. SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA has not reported this fact.

Let us recall that another incident which occurred when the monument to V.I. Lenin in Jelgava was being pulled down also ended in a brawl (fortunately without casualties). Incidentally, this happened after a USSR presidential decree condemning such unlawful acts. The Communists and war and labor veterans who tried to prevent the outrage against the monument were ousted by well-organized students from the Agricultural Academy.

The confrontation between separatists and those who want to preserve the USSR and between Latvians and Russian speakers has not yet developed into an open clash. But we were just one step away from that in Jurmala. How much more can providence be tested? Or must people die before the explosiveness of the situation is recognized?

Conflict could erupt anywhere and on any pretext because of the contradictions between republic and union laws and in what is essentially an atmosphere of lawlessness. People are disoriented and do not know which laws to obey. It is time at last to decide on the basis of talks and mutual consultations what to do in the future to prevent possible tragedies.

Latvian Supreme Soviet's Survival Questioned

91UN0218C Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in Russian 16 Oct 90 p 3

[Article by O. Shchiptsov; people's deputy of the Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet, assistant professor, and candidate of technical sciences; under the rubric "Point of View": "Will the Latvian Supreme Soviet Last Until 1991?"]

[Text] Someday books will be written about the hidden sources of the development of political events in Latvia after 1988. The role of Aleksandr Yakovlev, Boris Pugo, and Vadim Medvedev will de defined. Against the background of the action programs created by these men, as well as by an aktiv of Latvians abroad and the creative intelligentsia, Janis Vagris and Vitaliy Sobolevs will look like pale supernumeraries...

It interesting to recall that only about 18 months ago the newspaper ATMODA, characterizing an article about Latvia in the central press, wrote, "At the first reading of these reports the impression is created that Soviet Latvia was at the mercy...of nationalists—particularly of the Latvian People's Front [LPF] and several other informal organizations, which at any moment are prepared to implement secession from the Soviet Union." Impressions are all very well and good, but in the spring of this year an official of the LPF noted in that same newspaper, ATMODA, that "the formation of a healthy nationalism is taking place in our republic."

Today we are witnessing a sharp economic deterioration in the republic's situation. The shelves of the stores are empty as never before. It is difficult to "issue goods" against the coupons that have just been introduced for products. A slump in the operations of our enterprises is apparent even to the uninitiated. The system of economic ties is collapsing. The government's program, which was almost unanimously approved by the parliament, is proving ineffective. I will note that the program is almost wholly oriented toward the Eastern market and toward close relations with the Union, which "are of paramount importance to the Republic of Latvia Government." The words of Anatolijs Gorbunovs, spoken 12 June 1990 at a meeting of the USSR Council of the

Federation, still sound timely: "In order to characterize...the situation in Latvia within the context of the domestic policy of the USSR, I would use the sufficiently clear but at the same time harsh word 'impasse.' In my view, the search for a way out of the impasse is being executed quite inappropriately and ineffectively, even though this search is being carried out not only by a presidium of the Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet and a government that are practically homogeneous ethnically, but also by several dozen 'consuls' (USSR people's deputies from Latvia) in 'a friendly neighboring state.'"

It is not surprising that society is feeling uncertainty. People are worried by economic and political instability. The alarm is especially strong among non-Latvians in an historically multiethnic Latvia. Not only do the documents of the Latvian Nation Independence Movement and the activities of the civic committees trouble people, but the real nostalgia for the procedures of the authoritarian regime of K. Ulmanis, even as a rule-of-law state is beginning to be constructed, is especially unwelcome.

The second session of Latvia's new parliament is underway. But it is worth recalling how on 9 July 1990 the republic's Supreme Soviet was hardly dismissed when one of the deputies of the LPF faction proposed "that the mandate of deputies elected with the aid of the military be reconsidered." Reason triumphed on that occasion. But it is clear that this demarche was a "test of strength" by a certain portion of the LPF faction.

The question has been raised: The Citizens Congress or a Supreme Soviet? The Congress of Citizens aspires to the role of a supreme organ of power and is tied to a strict variant of the Law on Citizenship, which would present many permanent residents of Latvia with real discomfort.

One has increasing reason to contemplate the instability of the Supreme Soviet. Issues of secondary importance are being examined at plenary sessions even though we are already at the threshold of economic chaos. By acting in this fashion, the Supreme Soviet may end its own existence long before the finish of the so-called transition period. The likelihood of removing the opposition from parliament on some far-fetched pretext is not excluded. At present no one can predict how long the Supreme Soviet will exist. Will it last until 1991? In order to continue to exist, the parliament's activities must become more dynamic and constructive. Primary importance must be assigned to examining a package of urgent legislative acts directed at the introduction of market relations. The cooperation of both factions in the name of the interests of the voters is needed. The deputies of the LPF faction should not present themselves as some kind of monolith. The LPF encompasses a wide spectrum of politically diverse forces. It also contains a sufficiently large group of sensible people who are beginning to be troubled by the naked intriguing. Some of them clearly recognize that the threat of a new totalitarianism exists. Some are convinced that in the event of a seizure of power in the republic by radicals not only the opposition, but even many deputies of the majority faction will be subjected to repression. These people do not discount the possibility of tragic consequences resulting from adventurist actions (by either "rightist" or "leftist" extremists). Nonetheless, the feeling remains that a number of LPF deputies would rather function without dissenters. And this "number" is not so very small. It cannot or does not wish to understand the importance of an opposition in a democratic parliament.

I do not agree with those deputies of the opposition who believe that only a hard line can be effective. In the course of work the deputies of both factions are increasingly learning about the particular nature of the other faction. Personal contacts are being established. In a number of instances it has been possible to find compromises during work on draft bills. It seems to me that on the whole the opposition (the "Equal Rights" faction comprises 59 deputies out of 200) has already proven the constructiveness of its work. The image of an "implacable enemy" is being discarded. The ideal for society and parliament would be a movement toward a strong center on the basis of acknowledging the priorities of a democratic society. This postulate is natural for civilized states and peoples. Democracy and freedom presuppose the rapprochement of people in all spheres in a common desire to have a high standard of living. Today the words of Edgars Andersons, the famous historian of the Latvian community abroad, are timely: "From ancient times there has been in Latvia the quite serious—and so it remains today—problem of ethnic minorities, which cannot be solved simply through the use of edicts and instructions on deportation." I do not see an alternative to the formation of a strong center in Latvian society and in the parliament. The litmus test of the effectiveness of cooperation would be the adoption in the near future of a Law on Citizenship that, first and foremost, would take into account the most important element of democracy—defense of human rights and the absence of discrimination. Such cooperation for the good of the whole people of Latvia would be a pledge that parliament will work effectively and usefully for the whole period of time allotted to it by mandate of the people.

Riga Government Protests Garrison 7 Nov Acts

LD0911194490 Riga International Service in Latvian 1830 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Text] The Executive Committee of the Riga City Council of People's Deputies has sent a message to the military procuracy of the Baltic Military District demanding criminal proceedings against the leadership of the Riga city garrison in connection with the parade by military forces yesterday. The letter states that crimes were committed in this activity, connected with evident malicious insubordination to instructions by establishments of power, as well as with losses caused to the city's management by the disruption of transport traffic along the 11 November Embankment.

The leadership itself of the Riga city garrison also took an active part in these group-type violations of the law, states the letter from the Riga City Executive Committee to the military procuracy.

Estonian-RSFSR Treaty Under Discussion

LD1311142790 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Text] Many rumors have been evoked by the treaty between Estonia and the Russian Federation being discussed behind closed doors. What is the aim of the treaty and at what stage are the discussions on it? I addressed this question to Raul Malk, adviser to the chairman of Estonia's parliament. The treaty is about to be signed, he said.

Now the problem lies in fixing a date for signing it together with the Russian leaders. During my recent contacts we reaffirmed our intention to sign a treaty to our mutual satisfaction. With reference to the essence of the treaty, Raul Malk said that it is purely political. It defines the relationship between Estonia and Russia as two equitable states respecting each other's political status. As soon as the treaty is signed, said the adviser to Estonia's president, Estonia and Russia will sign an economic agreement to determine their economic, trade, and other mechanisms of their relations.

And in what way will Estonia's relations with the central government be built? Estonia, said Raul Malk, views the USSR as a neighbor country and intends to maintain neighborly ties with it. In the meantime the USSR persists in considering Estonia as one of its baltic republics. This cannot go on endlessly. There are several formulae that can be used and one of them was chosen by Lithuania which leapt into its independence. As for Estonia, it proclaimed a period of transition to realize it soveriegnty and independence and create an economic base to secure them. The period of transition is going on largely in acordance with the Estonian scenario, said Raul Malk. The Soviet Union has begun talks on the level of governmental delegations. Estonia has substantially expanded its ties with the outside world and made progress in reorganizing its domestic life in several areas. It formed a system of taxation, established an economic border and formed its own police force. Its parliament passed a bill on privatization and private property in its initial wording. According to Raul Malk, the relationship between Estonia's police and the central Ministry of the Interior, based on an agreement on cooperation, might become a model for establishing such ties. However, a number of Soviet bureaucrats have taken an opposite stand and embarked on the road of confrontation, he said.

Negotiations between the USSR and Estonia are to serve as the next stage of transition to Estonia's independence. what remains to be determiend is the level of those negotiations.

Talks on a level of governmental delegations had three rounds, said Raul Malk. Now experts are at work. Two or three sessions are to be held yet. According to our estimates, this might take 45 to 50 days. He is not authorized to make such suggestions, said Raul Malk, but the presidential level for continuing talks between Estonia and the Russian Federation would serve the interests of this cause in the best way possible. Such a level would give a strong impetus and lay businesslike foundations for the talks. Raul Malk gave a negative reply to the question about the possibility of Estonia's joining a new union treaty. Not a single serious politician enjoying support in the parliament and among voters in Estonia backs this idea. Estonian society simply won't follow him, said Raul Malk, adviser to the Estonian president.

Estonian Women Protest 'Soaring' Prices

914D0037A Moscow TRUD in Russian 7 Nov 90 p 1

[Article by TASS correspondent A. Kharchenko: "Prices Are Soaring"]

[Text] Tallinn—Firewood in Estonia is quintupling in price and the price of valuable varieties of timber is increasing by a factor of 6.6, and, consequently, the price of furniture will jump. Residents of the republic will have to pay twice as much for thermal power, and the price of electricity will also increase.

This unpleasant news was reported to journalists by T. Frey, minister of environmental protection, and A. Hamburg, deputy minister of industry and power engineering.

Paraphrasing A.S. Pushkin's story about Tsar Saltan which everyone knows from childhood, it can be said that prices in Estonia are growing "not by the day but by the hour."

Even now, without a bulging purse, you cannot do a thing in a commodity store or even in a food store. The other day I had occasion to see an elderly woman in a meat department buying two sausages, which have now almost tripled in price.

It should be noted that the rapid increase in prices is accompanied by a sharp drop in the quality of products. This was also mentioned by pickets organized by a committee of the Union of Working Women of Estonia in front of a government building. They held slogans in their hands with the question "Are our children doomed to starvation?"

Yeltsin Chairs Draft Constitution Commission

LD1311192390 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 13 TASS—The Russian Constitutional Commission met for a regular session here. The session was chaired by republican President Boris Yeltsin.

The commission considered a draft of the Russian Federation constitution, which was harmonised with account taken of proposals advanced by the republican parliamentary committees and commissions, and the

alternative drafts of the fundamental law. Members of the commission were informed about a public contest on the draft of the new constitution.

Participants decided to publish the draft Russian constitution for nationwide discussion no later than November 20. Proposals by Russian Federation people's deputies and citizens on the draft fundamental law will be taken into account and analysed. The next session of the commission will be held during the work of the extraordinary congress of the republic's people's deputies. The draft law of the Russian Federation "On Changes in the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the RSFSR" and the draft constitution of the Russian Federation will be submitted to the congress.

'Jury' To Choose Constitution by 1 Jan 1991

PM1311165190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[INTERFAX report: "Contest for the Best Constitution"]

[Text] A total of 36 versions of the republic Basic Law were submitted for the open contest for the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Constitution, announced on the instructions of Boris Yeltsin. This was reported to INTERFAX by Andrey Goltsblat, a specialist from the RSFSR Constitution Commission Secretariat. Two organizations participated in the contest—a department at the Saratov Legal Institute and the legal section of the Sverdlovsk "Uralmash" Production Association, as well as one team of two authors and some individual citizens. The overwhelming majority of drafts reflected trends toward radical democratic transformations in Russia. The jury in the contest, which is headed by Ruslan Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, will have the results no later than 1 January 1991.

RSFSR Law on Sovereignty's Economic Base

PM0211142390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Nov 90 Second Edition pp 1, 2

["RSFSR Law 'On Ensuring the Economic Foundation of RSFSR Sovereignty'"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] With a view to protecting the economic base of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] sovereignty and stabilizing and developing the RSFSR economy; guided by the declaration of RSFSR state sovereignty; and recognizing the right of republics belonging to the USSR to exclusive ownership, utilization, and disposal of their national wealth, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

Article 1. All land, minerals (deposits of diamonds, gold, platinum, precious and semiprecious stones, silver, oil, coal, gas, uranium, rare-earth nonferrous and ferrous metals, and other minerals), air space, water resources, forests, flora and fauna, and other natural and raw material resources on RSFSR territory, resources in the continental shelf and maritime economic zone of the RSFSR, stocks of anadromous fish breeds developing in RSFSR rivers beyond the boundary of the maritime economic zone, and artistic and cultural valuables constitute the national wealth of RSFSR peoples.

The procedure and conditions governing the ownership, utilization, and disposal of the aforementioned objects are regulated by legislation enacted by the RSFSR and the republics belonging to the RSFSR.

Objects of state ownership located on RSFSR territory, including the property of state enterprises, institutions, and organizations under union jurisdiction, their fixed production and nonproduction assets, and other all-Union assets and property managed by all-Union organs are the property of the RSFSR.

State property (paragraphs 1 and 3 of this article) can be assigned for management by the USSR in order to perform any functions voluntarily delegated to it by the RSFSR.

Article 2. The USSR's gold reserve and its diamond and foreign currency stocks are the property of the union republics.

The RSFSR recognizes the other union republics' right to their share of the USSR diamond and foreign currency stocks and gold reserve belonging to them. The specific amount of this share is determined on the basis of agreements with all union republics.

The procedure governing the ownership, utilization, and disposal of its share in the aforementioned stocks is determined by the Russian Federation on the basis of agreement with the republics and regions belonging to the RSFSR.

Article 3. The RSFSR reserves its own right, and recognizes the right of other union republics, to file claims on specific objects of ownership situated on the territory of another union republic within the time limit set by the republics. The procedure for determining claims will be laid down by agreements between republics.

Common (share or joint) property of the RSFSR and other union republics can be established on the basis of interrepublic agreements.

Fixed production and nonproduction assets and other property and resources of state enterprises, institutions, organizations, and organs of the RSFSR located on the territory of other union republics are the property of the RSFSR.

The RSFSR guarantees the protection of the property rights of union republics, foreign states, and their citizens and organizations on its territory.

Article 4. The RSFSR Council of Ministers is hereby empowered to dispose of and manage state (republican) property. The destatization and privatization of the aforementioned objects and assets, with part of them

remaining in state or municipal ownership and the right to complete economic management being transferred to enterprises, institutions, and organizations, is implemented in accordance with RSFSR legislation.

The transformation of state enterprises under union jurisdiction located on RSFSR territory into joint stock corporations and the transition to other forms of ownership are implemented exclusively subject to the conditions and procedures provided by RSFSR legislation.

Until such time as RSFSR laws on ownership and on privatization are adopted and a new Union treaty is concluded, no acts by USSR organs of state power and management involving confiscation of material, financial, foreign currency, and money assets and other property belonging to citizens, labor collectives, public organizations, and other owners are enforceable on RSFSR territory except as provided by RSFSR legislation.

Article 5. Union, union-republic, and interrepublic foreign economic deals involving resources and stocks on RSFSR territory listed in Articles 1 and 2 of this law and concluded without the RSFSR's consent are declared invalid.

The aforementioned agreements and deals come into force according to the procedure laid down in the RSFSR Law "On the Effect of Acts by USSR Organs on RSFSR Territory."

The RSFSR and the republics belonging to the RSFSR do not incur any liability under agreements and deals concluded by USSR organs in breach of the procedure laid down in this article.

The RSFSR Council of Ministers is hereby granted the exclusive right:
—to determine the procedure for issuing licenses or quotas for goods and services imported into or exported from RSFSR territory;
—to determine customs dues on export-import operations by participants in foreign economic activity operating under RSFSR jurisdiction;
—to register participants in foreign economic activity whose registered addresses are on RSFSR territory;
—to give accreditation to foreign firms, banks, and other organizations with branches on RSFSR territory;
—to allocate frequencies on RSFSR territory through licensing.

Article 6. The RSFSR does not incur any liability under all-Union loans or under agreements and deals concerning the resources and stocks listed in Articles 1 and 2 which have been concluded without coordination with the relevant RSFSR organs.

Article 7. Any decisions by USSR organs made without coordination with the relevant RSFSR organs and concerning officials, enterprises, institutions, and organizations under union and republic jurisdiction, located on RSFSR territory and operating in compliance with this law and other RSFSR legislation, are declared invalid.

[Signed] R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.
Moscow, RSFSR House of the Soviets, 31 October 1990.

Enabling Resolution

PM0211144990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

["RSFSR Supreme Soviet Resolution 'On the Procedure for Bringing Into Effect the RSFSR Law "On Ensuring the Economic Foundation of RSFSR Sovereignty" ""—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] The RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To bring the RSFSR Law "On Ensuring the Economic Foundation of RSFSR Sovereignty" into force from the moment of its adoption.

2. The RSFSR Council of Ministers should:

set up within one month an RSFSR State Committee for the Management of State Property and republican and territorial committees for the management and utilization of property;

elaborate and submit to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet a draft Law on Privatization, introducing three tiers of management of objects of ownership (by the RSFSR, by republics belonging to the RSFSR, and municipal) and guaranteeing the ownership and disposal of property by the producer of output (commodities);

elaborate within one month and submit for ratification by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet regulations and procedure for the management of enterprises on RSFSR territory regardless of their departmental subordination at the time the law was adopted;

elaborate and submit regulations for the performance of operations with resources listed in Article 1 of this law.

3. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the RSFSR Prosecutor's Office should perform the functions of overseeing the observance of this law.

4. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the RSFSR Council of Ministers should:

in coordination with the republics belonging to the RSFSR, prepare an agreement with union republics on the procedure for dividing the property, foreign economic debt, diamond and foreign currency stocks, and gold reserve of the USSR;

submit to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet within 10 days proposals for normative acts ensuring the application of Article 7 of this law.

5. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium should, within one month, submit to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet draft normative acts ensuring the creation of organs to protect Russia's sovereignty.

6. The RSFSR Council of Ministers should officially notify foreign missions and organizations of this law.

7. This law should be published in the central, republican, and local press.

[Signed] R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.
Moscow, RSFSR House of Soviets, 31 October 1990.

Leningrad City Council Studying Rationing

AU1311123490 Paris AFP in English 1204 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, Nov 13 (AFP)—Leningrad's city council is studying food rationing proposals, a city official said Tuesday.

Rusaliya Valiakhmietova, deputy director of the city's food committee, said in a telephone interview that "city officials are debating the issue but no decision has yet been taken."

Western sources said the city, which has a population of more than four million, had only very limited food reserves.

Last week Moscow's mayor, Gavril Popov, said food rationing tickets could be introduced in the Soviet capital on December 1.

Moscow City Soviet Discusses Market Transition

Paper Views Session Agenda

PM1411093190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

["Direct Line" report by Viktor Velikov: "How the Capital Will Make the Transition to the Market"]

[Text] The second session of the Moscow City Soviet began work on the morning of 11 November with a report by Moscow City Soviet Chairman G. Popov.

In his speech he pointed out that initially the session was planned for early fall, but the delay in the adoption at Union and republic levels of important decisions on the transition to market relations forced the postponement of its implementation. Now, having lost two very precious months waiting, there can be no more delay.

The main question the deputies have to discuss and adopt a specific action program on is the city's transition to market relations. In particular, they have to consider the specific agenda item "on the development of trade on market principles and guarantees for working people in the sphere of food provision." It is assumed that coupons will be introduced for basic foodstuffs. Recently, the Moscow City Soviet Presidium adopted a decision approving this necessary step, but the present city soviet session is to make the final decision on introducing coupons in the city.

Other issues connected with life in the capital are to be considered by the deputies—housing, Moscow's natural environment, taxation policy and the city budget for 1991, approval of the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee membership, and other matters.

The second session of the Moscow City Soviet will operate in two stages. The first will last till 23 November, then the deputies will take a break from plenary sittings to consider matters concerning standing commissions.

Popov Speech Cited

PM1311121390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Correspondents I. Aleksandrov and V. Belikov report: "Moscow Begins Transition to Market"]

[Text] The second session of Moscow City Soviet is continuing its work. As IZVESTIYA reported yesterday, its deputies heard a report by City Soviet Chairman G.Kh. Popov on the program for the capital's transition to the market. We publish an account of the main points in that report.

What is the essence of the program which has given rise to pointed, principled arguments among the deputies and elicited tremendous interest among Muscovites? The report pointed out that the country is in the grip of a profound crisis in the economy and in the Soviet system and of a national crisis. "All the crises have a single root. The country lacks real perestroyka," the main speaker said. "It is natural that all these crises could not but overwhelm Moscow too. Moreover, they are felt more keenly right here, in Moscow. The model communist city is becoming a symbol of the whole crisis of perestroyka."

The first Moscow City Soviet session had discussed the start of the transition to the market economy and planned to embark on transformations without waiting for changes in the country. However, it was decided to realize the capital's plans within the framework of the all-Russian "500 days" program, particularly as it had been proposed to form the all-union program precisely on its basis. However, as the main speaker emphasized, the plan adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet differs fundamentally from the programs of Yeltsin and Gorbachev. "In this plan the leading component of change is not the republics but the center and its apparatus. In this plan it is not the market but the government that dictates prices. In this plan inflation has been chosen as the mechanism of change... It is a plan of perestroyka which benefits and suits the apparatus. In the final analysis, it is a plan for the seizure of former state property by the former apparatus. In the actual situation which has taken shape in the country such a plan, in my view, is hardly realistic... We can wait no longer. Therefore we must return to our old plan and realize the program minimum."

In the program "minimum" it is proposed to resolve only those questions which relate to the competence of the Moscow Soviet; and what can be transformed more

easily, what is comprehensible and accessible to residents, and what they are more ready for is put in first place. It is a question of the minimum enabling us to start moving toward the market and of choosing work sectors which can ease even a little the hard life of Muscovites right now.

The report names these first work sectors—privatization of housing, funding of preschool education (payment of 70 rubles per child), privatization of trade, a free market, and the population's protection against elemental market forces.

At the second stage of the program "minimum" it is proposed to create the market infrastructure—to open in the city a commodity exchange, a labor exchange, stock exchanges, commercial banks, etc. The first steps have already been taken in this direction.

In addition, the agenda for this second stage includes questions of reducing state control in education, Moscow industry, the struggle against crime and the shadow economy, conversion of defense enterprises, etc.

The report emphasized that it is necessary right now to begin drawing up a general long-term plan of the concept of turning Moscow into a city living under conditions of commodity production, under conditions of a nonedict economy. It is necessary to draw up a plan for the development of the basic spheres of municipal services, the development of the city itself, the restoration of its historical assets and architecture, and the restoration of the center of Moscow and to draw up a program for the support of culture in the capital.

G.Kh. Popov devoted a lot of attention to the work of Moscow City Soviet itself and of its presidium, commissions, and executive committee and to relations among city and rayon components of the soviets.

"The new Moscow City Soviet will only justify its election," the main speaker said, "if we respond to the stream of endless difficulties over vegetables, garbage, or heating with a fundamentally new approach and begin really changing the foundations, the base on which we have lived all these years... What can we do in the present situation, given all our limited opportunities?

"First, we must do what we have already begun: take all the measures within our competence for the transition to the market.

"Second, we must defend the interests of the city and of Muscovites during the country's transition to the market.

"Third, we must hold out until real perestroyka begins in the country.

"Fourth, we must clearly dissociate ourselves from attempts to impose on Moscow City Soviet questions which it does not tackle, and, chiefly, we must dissociate ourselves from the realization of the president's program, since we already firmly know that it promises the country nothing but difficulties."

During the discussion of the report representatives of the Moscow Soviet's various factions were ensured the right to speak first. The deputies mainly approved the concept of the capital's transition to market relations and the specific priority measures outlined for implementing the program "minimum." At the same time substantial amendments were proposed on certain points in the report, and directly opposite viewpoints were even expressed. Several speeches were sharply critical of the work of Moscow City Soviet and its leaders and of muddle in the sphere of the division of legislative and executive power. To conclude the 11 November session sitting, G.Kh. Popov answered numerous questions from deputies.

At a plenary sitting on the morning of 12 November the deputies continued making up the agenda for the first half of the present Moscow City Soviet session. After the discussion and vote it was decided to introduce two additional items—support for the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Declaration of State Sovereignty and approval for the composition of Moscow City Soviet Presidium. Thus, a 13-point agenda has been approved.

Plans To Privatize Distribution

LD1311191190 Moscow TASS in English 1726 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Roman Grigoriyev]

[Text] Moscow November 13 TASS—"It is necessary to privatise Moscow's distribution network. The basic assets, equipment and turnover means should be handed over to those who works in stores, shops, cafes and restaurants," chairman of the Moscow City Council's Consumer Market and Services Commission Chairman Yuriy Solomatin [title as received] told TASS.

The development of the Moscow distribution network during the transition to a market-based economy is on the agenda of the current session of the Moscow city council. Deputies are expected to approve the distribution network privitisation plan worked out by the city council presidium at the end of October.

The work to be done is immense as the capital has 5,500 distribution enterprises. The situation is further complicated by the fact that they belong to tens of ministries and departments. They face a choice in changing their status—whether to become joint stock, cooperative, joint or lease enterprises.

Trade reform opens up broad opportunities for cooperating with foreign partners, Solomatin noted. The desire to open shops in Moscow has been expressed by firms from Finland, France and Britain, he said.

Specialists believe that privatisation is bound to entail spiralling prices. The draft being considered by the Moscow council envisages measures of social protection.

One of them is the introduction of coupons for essentials which will be sold at state prices.

The council session will continue until November 23. According to Solomatin and other experts, it is likely to approve the plan to privatise the city distribution network and introduce free enterprise.

Foreign Minister Meets U.S. Religious Figures

LD0911075690 Moscow TASS in English 0731 GMT 9 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Maslov]

[Text] United Nations November 3 TASS—Russian Federation Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev, currently here as a member of the Soviet delegation to the 45th session of the United Nations General Assembly, on Thursday visited New York's St. Nicholas Church which is the representation of Partriarch Alexey II of Moscow and All-Russia in the United States.

When greeting the guest, Archbishop Makarios pointed out that the Russian Federation foreign minister's visit is the best illustration of those positive changes that took place in the Soviet Union in the field of church-state relations. He welcomed the return of the people to their roots, to Christianity.

The parliament and government of the Russian Federation attach much importance to relations with compatriots abroad and to state assistance to religious, cultural, scientific and other missions in various countries, Kozyrev said.

He voiced hope that cooperation with representatives of the Orthodox Church in the United States would develop in the interests of broadening cultural links with those who had left Russia, who could return and would like to contribute to its revival.

On the same day Kozyrev met Israel Singer, secretary general of the World Jewish Congress, an authoritative non-governmental organisation.

They discussed possibilities for cooperation with American business circles in the economic and cultural fields and for broader contacts with compatriots living in the United States, Israel and other countries.

Andreyev Views Economic Council Competence

LD1111213490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1439 GMT on 11 November broadcasts a five-minute interview with Soyuz People's Deputy Yuriy Andreyev by station correspondent Andrey Nikiforov. The interview is in response to Mayak listeners' requests for more information on the tasks and competence of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Supreme Economic Council.

Andreyev says that the RSFSR People's Deputies Congress set up the Council in order to provide the correct strategy for the republic's economic development and mechanisms for implementing new economic ventures. Following the adoption of the 500 days program, the Council is to make recommendations, generalize grassroots by local authorities and enterprises, and propose mechanism for implementing the reform and transition to the market, Andreyev states. He adds that he has a list of 31 issues which the Council is dealing with in connection with implementing the 500 days program which he divides into two groups—in the first, the draft RSFSR Constitution and draft state structure of the republic; and in the second, issues relating to RSFSR agriculture. These issues, Andreyev says, are to be discussed at the Congress of People's Deputies at the end of November, and the Higher Economic Council has drawn up its own paper on them.

Asked whether the Higher Economic Council has any mechanism for reacting rapidly to the changing economic situation as the 500 days program gets under way, Andreyev replies there is not—there is only a plan for setting up working groups. He cites the RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA article of 1 November by Higher Economic Council Chairman Bocharov which states that one cannot tackle a new policy using old methods. The Council could take the burden of this from the legislature and government, but the fundamentals of the Council have still not been ratified, though they have apparently been adopted by the [RSFSR Supreme Soviet] Presidium. Neither the structure nor the staff of the Council have been ratified, so that the opportunities for normal working have not been created. Andreyev says that the Council is getting over its difficulties in a different way: "The fact is that the Higher Economic Council is one of the founders—together with Moscow Soviet, Leningrad Soviet, the RSFSR Ministry of the Press and Mass Media, and the U.S. Eisenhower Institute—of the Russian Economic Reform Fund. This is the channel through which many of the programs may be financed," he adds.

Andreyev goes on to give the account number for listeners to contribute money, valuables, and property to the fund through the Moscow Oblast board of the USSR Zhilsotsbank.

Presidential Rule Advantages Examined

91UN0197A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 44, 31 Oct 90 p 12

[Article by Prof Viktor Danilenko, doctor of legal sciences: "Fundamentals of the Basic Law. What Kind of Constitution Do We Need?"]

[Text] Items dealing with the Russian constitution that is in preparation have been glimpsed increasingly often in recent weeks on television screens and in the press. Working and expert groups of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Constitutional Commission have, as Commission Secretary O. Rumyantsev said, put in "preliminary efforts." They have been made public in a document with the title (motto, rather) "The Russia in

Which We Believe." A public competition was announced on 31 August even for proposals for the draft constitution. In a word, the wheel is turning—and mostly in the right direction. But granted all the outwardly reassuring picture, I, for example, am confused by certain propositions declared by the Russian Constitutional Commission.

First and foremost, what kind is the new constitution to be—permanent or temporary? The republic commission proposes the adoption of a permanent constitution. Such an intention is not, I believe, entirely well-founded (I am prepared to say the same about the Union Constitution also). It is contrary to the logic of the reform period. The country is at a turning point and is switching from one qualitative condition to another, and the pace of the transformations is increasing. What yesterday was being achieved with difficulty and seemed bold and radical is today ceasing to suit us and will tomorrow even appear an anachronism.

In a word, a permanent constitution is not justified from either the political or legal standpoints.

The sole prudent solution is the adoption of a constitution of the transitional period, which would make it possible to work out the components of the future political system "on the move" and would provide the necessary political base for democratic transformations. Such a constitution should, evidently, make particularly broad use of the institution of organic legislation. In an election situation, for example, a constitution is required to determine even the most important principles of suffrage, stipulating that this issue or the other will be regulated in detail by a special election law, that is, an organic act. We have had to rehash the Constitution so often because it has been heavily overloaded with specifics, in particular, with such details as the procedure of the nomination of candidates for deputy, the procedure of their registration, the list of public organizations competent to nominate candidates, and even the precise procedure by which they should do this.

Some specialists are endeavoring in the preparation of the constitution to circumvent questions connected with the social system. It is not hard to understand the sources of such a position—it is a reaction to the rectilinear wording, thickly mixed with demagogy, of previous Soviet Constitutions. Although things should not be taken too far. While rejecting overexposures, we cannot overlook the crux of the matter. The social arrangement simply cannot in a base politico-legal document be side-stepped. The majority of constitutions of Western countries, recording the republic form of government, unfailingly introduces the definition "social republic" (the basic law of the FRG speaks of the "principles of a free democratic system"), thereby endeavoring to transfer to the nature of state authority a general orientation of its activity. In addition, the right of ownership is guaranteed and the conditions and procedure of its alienation are strictly regulated.

None of this can be avoided in our constitution either. Whether the authors of the drafts like it or not, they will unfailingly have to occupy this ideological position or the other and record their attitude toward forms of ownership and, consequently, toward the system that they are endeavoring to create on a new legal base. This problem is, of course, complex and delicate. One thing is apparent—the constitution must enshrine the equality of all forms of ownership, private included (not slyly and not camouflaging the term).

Base democratic principles—popular sovereignty, representative and responsible government, separation of powers and comprehensive constitutional guarantees of the rights and freedoms of the individual—merit particular attention. It is not enough to proclaim them, they should be really operative principles.

It is necessary first and foremost to ensure the genuine supremacy of the legislature, without which talk about popular sovereignty and representative government remains just words. The consistent democratization of suffrage and assurance of its universality and equality are needed. And this is incompatible with parallel elections from public organizations leading de facto to a plural vote, that is, the granting of certain citizens several votes.

Reorganization of the structure of the central representative body itself and the abolition of such an institution as the Congress of People's Deputies are essential. The Congress might, possibly, have been justified upon the transition from the total lack of rights of the Supreme Soviet of the preperestroyka period to the restoration of its rights (considering the powerful counteraction of the party schedule-of-appointments system). But today this is in fact legalizing indirect, oblique elections of a standing legislature, which cannot fail to undermine the idea of popular sovereignty. It is not fortuitous that many Union republics have already renounced such an institution.

Assurance of the genuine supremacy of the legislature presupposes the precise regulation of relations between the legislature and the government. There is no doubt that much has changed here, but we still, as before, have a long way to go before we reach a truly democratic level. The mechanism of the collegial and individual responsibility of members of the government is still nominal. The government lacks courage for decisive steps dictated by the situation, the legislature, firmness (not to mention the fact that the constitutional mechanism itself has not been worked out here either). It is incomprehensible, for instance, how, given the real supremacy of the legislature, the prime minister may retain his office if the action program that he has proposed has been rejected by the deputies and, essentially, the people also. In civilized countries they usually resign themselves in such situations. Or another example: Why are measures in respect to a minister who has been at fault (specifically, in connection with the tobacco shortage) adopted by the country's president? The president may, of course, express his opinion.

But it is the legislature, to which the government and each of its members is legally responsible, which should decide his fate.

And the question of presidential authority? The version that exists currently, and this is becoming increasingly noticeable, is not distinguished by consistency—components of legislative and presidential forms of government are mixed together therein. There are virtually no analogies among leading countries, other than France. But the specifics of the constitutional mechanism there have a historical explanation. Two opposite directions clash here: the aspiration of a strong personality (General de Gaulle) to authoritarianism and strong parliamentary, democratic traditions, which de Gaulle was simply unable to completely overcome. The result of these directions was combined, synthesized mechanism. But we have never had traditions of parliamentary government.

Analyzing our constitutional development, one involuntarily arrives at the thought that it is predetermined to a considerable extent not only by the alignment of political forces, but also the character and position of political personalities. The constitutional institutions are being created for specific people, as it were. The powerful influence of the schedule of appointments is reflected. And this cannot fail to deform the unfolding constitutional-legal mechanism. There is no precision in regulation of the functions of the legislature and the executive. The Presidential Council, say, is considered by some of its members (N. Ryzhkov) merely a consultative and deliberative body; others (Ye. Primakov, V. Boldin) are convinced that its role cannot be confined to purely consultative functions and that it will necessarily evolve and that the Council should participate in the solution of current political problems.

But perhaps we should not be, in this case, reinventing the wheel but switching to a well-known form of government—parliamentary or presidential? Under our country's conditions a presidential republic is preferable, it seems to me—it ensures greater stability of state institutions, which is very important for the transition period. The president would exercise executive authority directly, would himself shape the government operating under his direct leadership, and would bear full responsibility for his actions. There would be a marked simplification of the mechanism of realization of the president's decisions inasmuch as the intermediate transmission components would disappear. The legislature, on the other hand, would—as the principle of separation of powers requires—obtain effective constitutional instruments for control of the president's actions. As a result both a strong legislative and a strong executive could be secured. And this applies not only to the Union level, but (primarily even, perhaps) also to the Russian Federation, which is merely preparing to create the institution of president.

I have already written in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA about the need for a law governing political parties and public organizations. I also would like to emphasize today that political parties are particular social associations, and their specific feature is that they, and they alone, conduct an open struggle for state power and for the right to form and politically orient the activity of the government. Consequently, the constitution should record, as a minimum, the principle of the freedom of their creation and activity and basic functions in the election campaign and legislative life. As far as the public organizations are concerned, their status and the procedure of their activity should be regulated separately from political parties.

A section on man's rights and liberties should be altogether fundamental in the constitution. But how should this be done? Let us take the version on which the RSFSR Constitutional Commission is working. So far it does not offer anything entirely new—it is based essentially on the well-known concept of the Social Contract of J.- J. Rousseau. The fact that we have finally matured to the point of acceptance of ideas formulated 250 years ago cannot in itself fail to be gratifying, of course. It is important how these ideas are realized. There are many reefs here, after all. For example, the question of limits of the declared rights, of the possibility of limitations on the part of the state authorities and on the permissibility (when and to what extent) of the use of force to defend the interests of society and the citizens. A realistic approach is undoubtedly needed. How, for example, to formulate the right to shelter, considering the situation in the country? After all, it is impermissible that the constitution be immediately, the moment it is adopted, of a fictitious nature and declare what is manifestly impossible.

Finally, one further aspect—legal regulation of foreign policy. Given a radical change in the nature of the federation and the proclamation of the sovereignty of the Union republics and with regard for the evolved world experience, the constitution should obviously establish a minimum of three fundamental propositions: renunciation of war as a means of solving foreign policy problems; the primacy of international law; recognition of the actual possibility of a limitation of state sovereignty in the interests of strengthening general peace and international security. It is not difficult to predict that the sharpest debate at the republic level will arise in connection with the second and, particularly, third propositions. We have always categorically refused to recognize them. Changes have occurred only most recently—with the establishment in our country of the new political thinking.

There is no mention of this, naturally, in the sovereignty declarations and laws recently enacted by the republics. Psychologically all is understandable—at this stage the emphases are the direct opposite. Yet a prudent limitation of sovereignty in no way contradicts the sovereignty of the state. If, of course, the corresponding decisions are not imposed from outside, but are voluntary and represent an act of the sovereign will of wholly independent authorities. By virtue of the particular features of its geographical and political position, the Russian Federation could in its elaboration of a constitution be the father of a new provision of constitutional law of great importance for our society.

In October, as far as I know, the RSFSR Constitutional Commission was to have completed the basic work on the draft, collation of the material of the public competition included. But we had none too clear an idea, it would seem, of the kind of complex task we would encounter. Was it serious in announcing a competition for a matter of weeks? And can the adoption of a basic law be submitted to the legislature without any detailed examination and discussion in the press?

Pickets Disrupt Air Traffic in Petrozavodsk

LD1311204290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Report by Correspondent B. Ternoushko in Petrozavodsk; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] In Petrozavodsk several hundred wives and children of air defense pilots blocked the take-off strip of the so-called dual base [dvoynogo bazirovaniya] airport of civil and military planes.

[Ternoushko] There have been continuous pickets of women and children on the runway for three days now. They have been standing there day and night. Even the frost and piercing wind cannot cool the inflamed passions. What has happened?

On the eve of the November holiday it became known that the units in which their husbands are serving were being ordered to transfer, and in the new place to which the families are being sent quickly they are not even promised either housing or jobs. There are no children's facilities there either. [passage omitted]

This order was the straw that broke the camel's back. Day and night the pickets have completely blocked the movement of passenger planes, and the visit to the military unit of Colonel General Tsarkov, first deputy commander in chief of the country's air defense troops, didn't change anything.

The procurator and internal affairs minister of Karelia managed with great difficulty to get an agreement on letting civil aircraft through. Today Petrozavodsk airport is once more open for flights. But the reasons which brought about the conflict remain.

Three MVD Soldiers Desert Omsk With Weapons

LD0911131690 Moscow TASS in English 1252 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Text] Omsk November 9 TASS—Scarcely had passions subsided following bandits' attack on cashiers at a factory of commercial-grade carbon—as a result of which 123,000 roubles were stolen—when two soldiers led by a junior sergeant, who were on guard duty, ran away from a military unit of USSR Interior Ministry [MVD] troops on Thursday night, taking away with them three submachine-guns, five pistols and a large amount of ammunition.

While in the case involving the cash theft, Omsk and Novosibirsk militia reacted swiftly—the criminals were apprehended several days later and cash was returned to the factory personnel, it is now very difficult to foretell developments.

Omsk militia, personnel of the Omsk Sate Security Department and Interior-Ministry troops have been alerted. Search teams and special-purpose squads are in full combat readiness.

Specialists highly skilled in exposing such crimes arrived here by air from Moscow the same night. The urgency and seriousness of measures are prompted by the need to prevent the weapons from being used, to avoid casualties and render the criminals harmless.

Deserters Recaptured

PM1311134190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[Yu. Shpakov article: "Arrested With Weapons"]

[Text] Yesterday our newspaper reported an extraordinary occurrence: Three guards had deserted from an MVD military unit, taking with them three assault rifles, five pistols, and a large quantity of cartridges. It is quite hard to predict the future course of events, the report noted...

Fortunately, the Omsk militia again proved equal to the task. The criminal investigation staffers marked their professional holiday with a successful operation—all three deserters were arrested and the stolen weapons returned. There have been no casualties.

Just how did events develop? A radio appeal was made in the morning asking the citizens for help. Many people responded, and one of the leads that came in proved accurate.

A snatch squad cordoned off an apartment block on the outskirts of town, where the deserters were holed up. Two of them—Junior Sergeant O. Tashkin and Private P. Dudukalov—surrendered straightaway. But Private S. Nadezhin refused to hand over his pistol for two hours and threatened to kill himself. Finally, he too was persuaded to give up. So no fateful shots were fired. The possibility that the weapons were seized with a view to being resold is not being ruled out.

Western Republics

No Consensus on Moldovan Resolution

LD1311201990 Moscow TASS in English 1944 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Fedor Angeliy]

[Text] Kishinev: November 13 TASS—The Moldavian parliament today continued the quest for compromises to settle the serious socio-political situation in the republic. Possibly, it is the first time in two years of

confrontation between the Moldavian and non-Moldavian parts of the republic's population that the majority of deputies were unanimous in ruling out the use of force in solving ethnic conflicts.

Petr Luchinskiy, chairman of the conciliatory commission, said in parliament that convincing residents of the Gagauz areas and the Dnestr region of the sincerity of the republican parliament itself was now moving to the fore among the tasks to be accomplished by parliament.

To this end, he said, it is necessary that parliament adopts a package of measures drawn up by the commission. These measures involve creating the Gagauz administrative-territorial entity, Moldavia's participation in elaborating the Union treaty and proportional representtion of national minorities in state and economic management bodies.

Parliament should also officially deny speculation about the possibility of Moldavia joining Romania.

It is also envisaged to set up a department on nationality issues to be headed by a representative of national minorities.

Luchinskiy emphasised that if these measures were not taken at the present session of parliament, the situation in Moldavia would continue to deteriorate. He called upon deputies to show wisdom, commensurate their actions with reality and adopt the measures proposed by the commission.

During the discussion of the draft resolution, deputies failed to reach a consensus. It was proposed to adopt the resolution after further study, taking into account numerous remarks made today.

Luchinskiy Calls Situation 'Paradox'

LD1311211490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Report by M. Sokirz from Kishinev on 13 November, including statement by P.K. Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Moldova Communist Party Central Committee—from the"Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Sokirz] These days, the situation in Moldova remains complex. A very sharp political struggle is underway. It is quite understandable that at the session of the USSR-Moldova Supreme Soviet, which is taking place at the moment, two basic, chief, questions, are being discussed: How to stabilize the sociopolitical situation in the republic; and the government's new economic concept.

[Luchinskiy] I have to say that it is a paradox. In general, it consists of the fact that everybody understands that we need to arrive at peace and accord. On the other hand, when you talk in groups, each person utters yet another whole range of complaints. Despite the complex situation, it has to be said that a kind of point of relative calm has now arrived. There is general interest on the part of all the sides. On the whole, in the entire population there is experience, and that is a basis for advancement. I am sure that this road will be difficult, and perhaps it will develop slowly, but it will develop in the direction of preserving the integrity of the republic and the development of its economy and culture, taking into account the demands and interests of all the people living in our republic.

Moldova MVD Chief Unreachable During Shootings

PM1311163190 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 24 Nov 90 p 2

[TASS correspondents F. Angeli and V. Demidetskiy dispatch: "The Minister and the Secretary on the Events in Dubossary"]

[Excerpts] Kishinev, 12 Nov—At a news conference in Kishinev, I. Kostash, minister of internal affairs of the SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of Moldova, expressed his dissatisfaction with the fuss created by the central mass media around the events in Moldova and in particular the case of the killings in Dubossary. [Passage omitted]

The day before, V. Oborok, second secretary of the Dubossarskiy Party Raykom [rayon committee], who witnessed the tragic events, called the TASS correspondents' center in Kishinev. This is what he said:

"After the first shots rang out on Poltavskiy Bridge at the entrance to Dubossary, and 'cheremukha' [crowd control gas] was used by the special purpose militia detachments and the militia, I took two wounded people to a first aid station and then to the hospital in my car.

"Having quickly returned to the raykom, I dialed the telephone number of I. Kostash, minister of internal affairs of the SSR of Moldova. An MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] duty officer answered. I asked him to put me through to the minister urgently, since there was bloodshed at the approaches to the town and bursts of submachinegun fire could be heard. I was told tersely: 'The minister is not in the office.' Then I asked for one of his deputies. However, it proved impossible to talk with them. In answer to my question: 'Who can stop the bloodshed?,' the duty officer said that the militia operates on the personal instructions of Prime Minister M. Druk. After a while I managed to be put through to him, but I had to talk to him... through the same MVD duty officer. This is how we talked: I explained the situation to the militiaman, he passed it on to Druk, and vice versa. M. Druk asked me, through the duty officer: 'What is happening there, are they raiding nurseries and schools?' I answered that people are being shot at in the streets at the entrance to the city. 'People should stay at home,' the prime minister snapped."

Paper Carries Appeals for Compromise

91UN0239A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA in Russian 25 Oct 90 p 1

[Three appeals by Moldovan groups: "For Civil Peace and National Concord"]

[Text]

APPEAL of a Group of the Gagauz Intelligentsia to All Inhabitants of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic

Dear Compatriots! Gagauz, Moldavians, Ukrainians, Russians, Bulgarians, Jews, and people of other nationalities inhabiting Moldova!

The tension in the republic's social and political atmosphere has reached a critical point. The family of peoples of Moldova is in danger of splitting up. The process of people's demarcation along national lines, which would lead to the confrontation of peoples which have resided together on this territory for centuries, is moving inexorably.

The heavy burden of past mistakes, miscalculations, and deformations is today oppressing equally all inhabitants of Moldova. It is only possible to improve the life of and ensure a decent future for our children and grandchildren by joint efforts and common labor in an atmosphere of peace and concord among all those living in our region. Each inhabitant is today responsible for the fate of the republic. The development of events could entail grim consequences and jeopardize the vital interests not only of the present but also of future generations. History not only vindicates, it also cruelly punishes. Now is not the time to be engaging in mutual recrimination and reproach and arguing about who understands the causes of the confrontation and how. It could be, God forbid, that it is too late and that there might be no one left to confess the mistakes of one side or another if the whole ship goes down.

Esteemed compatriots! We appeal to the wisdom of people of the older generation who were able in the years of severe ordeals and the horrors of war, tyranny, and arbitrary action to preserve the friendship and mutual understanding of all the peoples of Moldova. Your paternal counsel and experience of life are needed more than ever today to curb passions and calm the impatient.

We appeal to the youth. You will have to live and raise children on this long-suffering land together with your brothers and sisters of other nationalities. Stretch out your hand to one another for the common cause and for preservation of the age-old traditions of good-neighborliness and mutual understanding.

We appeal to mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters with faith in the fact that your love and sympathy, patience, and wisdom will help soften hardened hearts, stop those hurtling toward chaos, calm the frightened and the suffering and restore peace and tranquillity to our cities and villages, homes, and families.

We appeal to all of you good people! Find within yourselves the strength to halt the fatal development of events, listen to one another and resolve in quiet counsel all problems. One's happiness cannot be built on others' misfortune, a sturdy house cannot be built without good neighbors and true friends.

The policy of confrontation is played out. We now need to switch to a policy of compromise, political concessions, and political dialogue.

We hope that the parliament elected by the people, leaders of parties and social and political movements, and the people's deputies, aware of the full extent of their historic responsibility for the fate of the peoples of Moldova, will apply sufficient forces and display wisdom for a dignified escape from the present crisis and a just resolution of accumulated contradictions.

[Signed] F. Angeli, N. Baboglo, S. Bozbey,, G. Gaydarzhi, A. Dimoglo, D. Dimchoglo, T. Zanet, V. Karaganchu, I. Kostandoglo, S. Kuroglo, G. Topuzlu, G. Tabunshchik.

STATEMENT by a Group of First Secretaries of City and Rayon Committees of the Communist Party of Moldova

Dear Fellow Citizens!

The atmosphere in the republic has reached crisis intensity. We are on the threshold of a Karabakh, which cannot be permitted. The majority of people with common sense are aware of this and are doing everything possible to prevent violent action.

Supporting M.S. Gorbachev's appeal to the people of Moldova, we believe that only through dialogue and mutual compromise may bloodshed be avoided. Certain improvements in the resolution of conflict situations have emerged and a search for mutually acceptable solutions both on the part of the Moldova SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and representatives of the South and the Dnestr region has begun of late. We hope that ways to support guarantees of citizens' political and economic rights will be found and that the height of the interethnic tension will be lowered in the course of the dialogue.

However, the Moldovan Popular Front and a number of public movements making common cause with it, attempting to impede this process, have come out with a provocative appeal for the formation of volunteer squads, threatening a national catastrophe with unforeseen consequences. We consider this appeal and the threats to be an outright political provocation, which would lead to a new spiraling of the exacerbation of interethnic relations and disastrous confrontation.

Civil peace and national concord may be achieved only through a search for rational compromise, with a display here of wisdom, patience, and an ability to come to terms with the interests of the representatives of all the nationalities which live in the region.

[Signed] N. Bakherkin, first secretary of the Chadyr-Lungskiy Raykom [Rayon Party Committee].
Ye. Berdnikov, first secretary of the Rybnitsa Gorkom [City Party Committee].
B. Brizitskiy, first secretary of the Sloboziyskiy Raykom.
I. Zaretskiy, first secretary of the Tiraspol Gorkom.
F. Manolov, first secretary of the Komrat Gorkom.
P. Tsymay, first secretary of the Bendery Gorkom.

FROM AN APPEAL to All Citizens of the Republic, the Moldova SSR Supreme Soviet and M. Snegur, president of the Moldova SSR, from the "Yedinstvo" Intermovement Presidium

The situation in Moldova has intensified and become extremely explosive. At this extraordinarily difficult time all people to whom the future of the republic is dear and who wish for civil peace and interethnic concord should unite in the name of a sacred and noble goal—protection of the individual and the revival of the republic. The way to this goal was charted in the well-known appeal of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, who summoned all of us to dialogue and a joint search for rational compromise. There is no alternative to this.

The people expect of the present leadership of the republic assertive activity, constructive ideas, and creative practical steps aimed at a solution of the problems disturbing all of us.

We are convinced that the sole realistic platform which could remove the tension in the republic is to ensure that all contending forces recognize the unconditional priority of human rights and values common to all mankind, renounce the division of citizens in the republic into "indigenous" and "migrants," "hosts" and "guests" and support the territorial unity of the republic in forms acceptable to all. World practice has accumulated considerable experience in solving such problems, and it is essential that we make use of it.

Unfortunately, there are forces in the republic which do not know how and do not want to solve the urgent problems by political methods. Accustomed to methods of power pressure and "big stick" policy, they are today also attempting to "flex their muscles" and set one part of the population against another. We see the call for the creation of volunteer squads at the place of residence and work as an unconcealed attempt to unleash civil war in the republic.

Fellow citizens! There is no higher value than human life and there are no problems to which an intelligent person with common sense cannot find a solution. We call on you to keep calm and not succumb to irresponsible appeals. We believe that a way out of the present critical situation will be found by the peaceful path and that unity, fraternity, solidarity, and liberty will triumph on Moldovan soil.

Ukraine Seeks CSCE Observer Status

PM1311103990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Nov 90 Union Edition p 5

[A. Shalnev report under "IZVESTIYA Correspondents on World Events" rubric: "The Ukraine's Appeal to Paris Meeting Participants; They Want To Obtain Observer Status"]

[Text] New York—The Ukraine has submitted an official application for observer status at the Paris meeting of heads of CSCE states and governments which is scheduled for 19-21 November, as well as at subsequent meetings.

Anatoliy Zlenko, Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] foreign minister who is now in New York, sent the relevant letter Wednesday to French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas. Simultaneously the Ukraine's permanent UN mission sent a note to the permanent missions of CSCE countries participating in the Paris meeting informing them of its request regarding observer status and expressing the hope that it will receive these countries' support during consideration of the request.

The Ukraine's diplomatic step is a consequence of the Declaration of State Sovereignty adopted by the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet in July this year proclaiming that "the Ukrainian SSR is an equal partner in international affairs... and participates directly in the Helsinki process and in European structures."

Anatoliy Zlenko told me that the question of the Ukraine's observer status "was agreed with Moscow and was the subject of talks."

Judging by the information obtained in UN corridors, the talks in fact got nowhere and Moscow let it be understood that it is not prepared to support Kiev's efforts aimed at obtaining status at the Paris summit meeting. In fact, after this the Ukraine appealed directly to Paris.

I inquired of the Ukrainian SSR foreign minister whether he thinks that the question of status will be resolved before the meeting occurs. "It's hard to say," the minister replied, "little time is left... But one thing is clear: We are raising the question. We will raise the question and consider it legitimate to raise it."

Ukrainian Legislature Discusses Ownership Bill

LD1311192890 Moscow TASS in English 1651 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Stanislav Volnyanskiy]

[Text] Kiev November 13 TASS—The Ukrainian parliament today began discussing a landmark bill on ownership, presented by the government. Deputies were also presented with an alternative bill, drafted by the Commission for Economic Reform and Management, with the main emphasis laid on private ownership.

A second reading of regulations on the credentials and ethics commission was held.

As three weeks ago, when it was submitted for the first reading, the parliament failed to reach consensus even though proposals and remarks from working groups, set up on a territorial and political basis, were collected and closely studied.

The discussion of articles relating to deputy ethics and sanctions for ethical violations sparked keen debates.

Articles on sanctions for unethical behaviour met with especially strong objections, with some deputies saying they violated human rights. A representative of the "People's Rada" [council] made a statement notifying deputies that that opposition parliamentary group would not vote and intended to set up its own ethics commission to discuss behaviour and actions by deputies from the "people's rada".

However, they failed to disrupt the endorsement of the regulations on the credentials and ethics çommission.

Paper Reports Kravchuk 26 Oct News Conference

91UN0248A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 28 Oct 90 p 3

[UKRINFORM correspondents A. Grigoryev and V. Demidenko report on news conference by L.M. Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, on 26 October; place not given: "L.M. Kravchuk News Conference"]

[Text] A month has elapsed since the start of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Second Session. This period has been far from simple and unambiguous: Passions have raged not only in the meeting hall but also around the Supreme Soviet building, on Kiev's streets and squares. Nonetheless, the deputies have in this time adopted a number of important decisions. Some results of the Ukrainian legislature's work were dealt with at a news conference given by L.M. Kravchuk for Soviet and foreign journalists on 26 October.

At the news conference L.M. Kravchuk paid considerable attention to an analysis of the mass media's coverage of the session's business. Specifically, it was a question of the journalists not always evaluating parliament's activity objectively and comprehensively. Emphasis has been put on the fact that political crisis has set in in the work of the session and the reader has been led to the conclusion that the Supreme Soviet has not long to live and is incapable of coping with the problems that confront the republic at this time.

Does such an evaluation correspond to actual reality? A situation in which business was almost halted and the representatives of the Narodnaya Rada walked out of the meeting hall and declined to vote came about so many times at the first session. But there were no such evaluations at that time. On the contrary, the newspapers wrote that a process of mutual understanding was underway and that new people had assembled beneath the roof of the Supreme Soviet for the first time following democratic elections. For this reason both the diversity of opinions and the political passions were all a natural phenomenon. Suddenly, after the session has adopted the Declaration, the law on the Ukraine's economic independence, and a number of other important documents, these evaluations appear.

I can say with all due responsibility, L.M. Kravchuk emphasized, that there has been no crack in the work of the Supreme Soviet session. To speak and evaluate the situation in broad political formulas, then, perhaps, on the contrary, since that period—a period of debate, a period of misunderstandings, which have arisen, are now arising, and will continue to arise with us—we have, for all that, reached a most important conclusion: Different political parties and groups in the Supreme Soviet adhere to different ideological principles. But the viewpoint is almost uniform on what is most important concerning the prospects and paths of the Ukraine's development. Except for certain extreme forces, which there are in every parliament.

We have concluded that it is essential in the Supreme Soviet to officially structure a majority and minority and formulate criteria protecting the rights and positions of the minority. It is necessary also to adopt rules of behavior and of the honor of each people's deputy. We need to have all the documents that regulate the work of the session itself. This is the position of the vast majority of deputies, who want to work constructively. Only 14 of them voted against this.

The media's coverage of the business of the Supreme Soviet requires more detailed analysis. In L.M. Kravchuk's opinion it is necessary to write more about the "political cuisine" of the Supreme Soviet, about how laws are prepared, what kind of processes are occurring, and how each deputy rethinks his position, his understanding, and his attitude toward this problem or the other.

The chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet analyzed certain articles on the students' hunger strike, specifically "Who Could Have Thought It?" in the newspaper SILSKI VISTI of 19 October, and noted its tendentiousness. It was emphasized that there are questions to which the Supreme Soviet cannot give an answer immediately. This applied primarily to the Union treaty and the dissolution of the Supreme Soviet. Decisions on them required three to four months. The discussion with the students, which, incidentally, was broadcast by television, was like this. As the session had decided. Work is now underway on the elaboration of a new constitution, and a referendum will be held somewhere around the end of 1991.

I am convinced, L.M. Kravchuk went on to say, that the Supreme Soviet in the current composition of deputies has the potential for working and adopting decisions and

laws. Our principal task now is the adoption of a program of transition to the market. The situation is complex and serious, but we are working and will adopt documents in keeping with the interests of all strata and groups of the population of the Ukraine.

L.M. Kravchuk then answered journalists' questions. It was a question, in particular, of the alignment of political forces in parliament and relations between them. It was observed that a normal dialectical process was underway at the session and that affinity and compromise were being found where this concerned the people's interests.

This process is not understood merely by those who have arrived at extreme right and left positions. However, the situation should not be dramatized. The majority of people's deputies is advocating constructive work, and the people's interests are for them higher than their own. But there are also those who accept absolutely no attempts to introduce the order, the tolerance, and the intelligent and civilized approach which there has to be in such a body as the Supreme Soviet. I would like the journalists to show in greater depth all the processes that are taking place and to reflect the various viewpoints.

Concerning the Second All-Ukraine Assembly of the Ukrainian Popular Movement [Rukh], L.M. Kravchuk emphasized that Rukh could not have failed to have left positive traces in the life of society. Many ideas like, say, sovereignty, economic independence, and privatization were in the program of its first congress even. They have become a part of the program of transition to the market. This cannot be denied. At the same time, the speaker said, Rukh would, in my view, have acquired more authority had it embarked more energetically on the implementation of these ideas.

As a social and political movement, Rukh is not united and homogeneous. Some part of it has in fact declared war on communist ideology and the Communist Party. Rukh's forces are geared to this task. It has by this, in the opinion of the chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, weakened its opportunities. For if the program of a party which is under the wing of Rukh records the proposition that communist ideology is antipopular and unsuitable for any times—this has been recorded by the Ukrainian Republican Party—people are, naturally, adopting a very guarded attitude toward such a program proposition. They understand that from theory to practice is not that great a distance.

We need to enact a law on parties and public organizations. They must have equal rights and opportunities. This is the proposition of a democratic society.

L.M. Kravchuk explained why the proceedings of the Second Rukh Congress are not being carried on radio and television. He quoted the contents of a copy of a document signed by D.V. Pavlychko. The Rukh Secretariat requests the republic State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting for assistance in the videotaping of all sessions of the congress for the subsequent making of a documentary film.

"For the purpose of securing Rukh's copyright to the material filmed," the document says, "we request that you prevent the broadcast and relay by cable beyond the bounds of the 'Ukraine' Palace." To broadcast or not to broadcast is the right of each party. But precision and clarity are needed, and there should be no innuendoes and shifting of responsibility from one to another. There is, after all, already talk to the effect that some people have banned a broadcast of the Rukh congress.

Many questions connected with the new Union treaty and the transition to market relations were heard at the news conference.

We have not yet adopted our program, the chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet said. Nonetheless, we have already concluded an economic agreement with the Russian Government. We believe that the Soviet Union, as a state, as a union of republics, may endure only on the basis of a strengthening of economic relations in all spheres. The Union treaty, as a political formula, should grow out of economic union. People must see and experience the advantageousness of this union based on the principles of a voluntary approach, fairness, and mutual respect. And the most important thing today is bringing order to bear where people's fate is decided, in their daily lives.

Answers to questions concerning the activity of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, military service by citizens of the republic, and others were also given.

Rukh Chairman Drach Interviewed on Prospects

91UN0248B Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 7 Nov 90 p 2

["First express-interview with the poet Ivan Drach, people's deputy of the Ukraine and newly elected Rukh chairman," by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent for the Ukraine S. Kiselev; place and date not given: "Workers' Vests Instead of Cossack Jerkins"]

[Text] [Kiselev] What are your impressions of the Second All-Ukraine Rukh [Ukraine People's Movement for Perstroyka] Assembly?

[Drach] One is aware of the numerical and qualitative growth of the Popular Movement of the Ukraine as such. Although as a social and political organization Rukh has not yet acquired the strength on which we were counting when we formed it last year. We hoped at that time that the movement would expand more purposefully and work more efficiently. But such are the realities. Rukh remains to a considerable extent a social and political organization of the republic's West Ukrainian structures. This was seen and reflected in the representation at the congress itself—half the delegates came from the western oblasts: Lvov, Ternopol, Ivano-Frankovsk, Chernovtsy, Volyn, and Transcarpathian. And all of Greater Ukraine, including its center, south, east, and north, constituted the second half of the delegates. And although there are

today just under 633,000 members of Rukh and approximately 5 million of its supporters, these are not, understandably, that many in a republic of 52 million. Speaking at the congress as a delegate, the Lugansk poet Yelena Bondarenko said that Rukh could only win when to the Lvov greeting "Glory to the Ukraine!" mining Lugansk amicably responded "Glory to the Heroes!" And I have to agree.

[Kiselev] During the Rukh congress the presidium received notes saying that there was too much criticism of the CPSU and Moscow and not enough constructive proposals on how to achieve the Ukraine's real sovereignty, how to extricate the republic from the economic crisis....

[Drach] To a considerable extent these notes were justified inasmuch as the four-day congress was reminiscent of a mixture of mass meeting and scientific conference. Now, as Vladimir Chernyak, delegate to the congress, USSR people's deputy, and well-known Ukrainian economist, said, it is essential to involve ourselves in constructive work. I hope that it will be concentrated under the aegis of the Rukh research institute which is being created, where our economists, historians, political scientists, and others will be able to work effectively and where constructive ideas defending our future will be assembled and elaborated.

[Kiselev] What, in your view, are Rukh's prospects?

[Drach] In the Ukraine there are currently several parties which represent implacable opposition to the CPSU: republican, democratic, peasant, and youth organizations, and others. But confronting the party colossus in isolation is impossible. The organization capable of uniting their scattered efforts and bringing all democratic forces of the republic together in the struggle for the complete dismantling of the communist system and the creation of a sovereign democratic Ukrainian state is undoubtedly the Rukh.

[Kiselev] On the eve of the Second All-Ukraine Rukh Assembly you said that you intended handing over the reins of government to others. Nonetheless, you have once again been elected Rukh chairman....

[Drach] Yes, this was my intention—quitting the leadership of the social and political organization. But the current situation forced me to remain. I decided to make one further attempt to unite the opposed forces which there are in Rukh and which could lead to its division and destroy the movement from within—radicals and the more moderate.

[Kiselev] What, in your view, is the task confronting Rukh in the immediate future?

[Drach] I hope that the new Rukh year will be less of a mass-meeting and more of a working nature geared to lively, vigorous activity. I hope that the desire of a congress delegate, the writer Vladimir Yavorivskiy, people's deputy of the USSR and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and a founder of Rukh, to the effect that the time has come for Rukh to take off its Cossack jerkins and put on workers' vests will really be embodied in practice.

Lvov Protestors Seek Cathedral Lands' Return

LD1211123190 Kiev International Service in English 0000 GMT 12 Dec 90

[Text] Today several thousand people have blocked traffic in Lvov, western part of the Ukraine. They demanded that the entire territory of St. George's Cathedral should be returned to Greek Catholic believers. As we already reported, this church was passed over to the Uniates but the territory around the church was settled by local residents. The believers also demanded that the military radio masts located near the cathedral should be given to the believers to transmit a new radio station of the Greek Catholic believers called Holos Dzvonu [Voice of the Bell]

Ukrainian Official on Chernobyl Disaster

AU1311160390 Budapest MAGYAR NEMZET in Hungarian 10 Nov 90 p 6

[Interview with Volodimir Javorivskiy, representative of the Soviet and Ukrainian legislatures, and member of the leadership of the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka, by Laszlo Vida; in Kiev in October 1990: "Chernobyl Time-Bomb—Atomic Desert"]

[Excerpts] An ecological timebomb is ticking a few hundred kilometers from our borders, and we do not want to know anything about it. Naturally, we are talking about the nuclear power station that is no longer frontpage news in the world press at this stage, five and a half years after the disaster. Chernobyl simultaneously turned into the symbol of the self-destructive power of an unprotected and vulnerable human civilization, and of the total failure of a system claiming its own omnipotence. Now, Chernobyl is slowly being forgotten, its value has dropped on the mass media's international information market, and it has become a boring topic. The problem is that Chernobyl's history did not at all end with the extinguishing of the flames and the building of the famous concrete coffin; on the contrary, that is where its history began. We asked Volodimir Javorivskiy whether it was at all possible at this stage to estimate the consequences of the April 1986 explosion. Javorivskiy heads the committee recently set up by the Kiev legislature whose function it is to—at long last—reveal the causes behind the catastrophe, to identify the people who bore the political responsibility for the accident, as well as to evaluate the ecological, economic, social/public health, and cultural consequences of the disaster.

[Javorivskiy] Even for a more developed, richer and more flourishing society than ours, it would take at least 100 years to recover from the events in Chernobyl. What can I say about the Ukraine of today, then? Indeed, our country had been brought to the verge of an ecological

disaster even before Chernobyl. Moreover, this misfortune affected us in the midst of the most dramatic economic recession; we have run out of reserves, our treasury is empty, and everywhere we run into the barriers of demoralizing and humiliating shortages: There is no soap, there are no irons, no contraceptives, and no freezers, and there are not even enough airplanes to deliver aid packets, although these disappear in the maze of bureaucracy and corruption, anyway.... Therefore, Chernobyl is a double tragedy for us, and as time goes by, it raises the Ukrainian nation's Hamlet-type question: To be, or not to be? If we are unable to defend ourselves in time, and if we do not take necessary measures soon, then Hungary's next-door neighbor may turn into a nuclear desert. Of course, there is no guarantee, either, against the spreading of this atomic desert, with its inherent genetic and environmental aspects—not in our lifetime, of course, but generations from now.

[Vida] Still, amidst these immeasurable misfortunes, is it not fortunate that the catastrophe happened under perestroyka?

[Javorivskiy] If all this had happened during the seventies, for example, then we would probably only have been told about a minor breakdown. Remember that the explosion happened at the very beginning of the "melting" democratization process, but even then, we are only able to evaluate the real extent of the devastation and damage five years later, and we are only just starting with our work. [passage omitted]

[Vida] What percentage of the population was directly affected by the initial radiation? According to Yurko Tkachenko, chairman of the Ukrainian green party, it has officially been admitted that only one out of the 21 Ukrainian oblasts "escaped" the catastrophe without very serious radiation levels.

[Javorivskiy] It is estimated that approximately 3 million people were directly affected by the raised radioactivity levels, in that their organisms immediately showed detrimental alterations. Week after week, news arrive about new areas being affected by detrimental radiation. Furthermore, we are only at the very beginning of our struggle. Our parliamentary committee has to elaborate an ideology specific to Chernobyl, on the basis of which we can start combating the consequences of the disaster. At the same time, we have no illusions, Chernobyl cannot be defeated, and we will have to live with the consequences of the disaster for ten to 15 generations. [passage omitted]

[Vida] What will happen to the people who were responsible, to the guilty people?

[Javorivskiy] The Soviet Union will fall apart tomorrow or the day after, but even if it does not, the Ministry of Atomic Power Engineering and Industry could be dissolved at any point. In that case, we will not find the responsible people. We can hardly present a bill to Russia; it is the center that is responsible for everything. That is why we are hurrying, and one of our subcommittees is trying to evaluate the size of the damage incurred by the Ukraine as a result of Chernobyl. At present, we estimate the total sum at 200 billion rubles, and we are even prepared to collect this sum through an international court of justice.

[Vida] That sum is roughly a third of the Soviet Union's national income. You will never receive that amount.

[Javorivskiy] I agree with you. That is why we are thinking along alternative lines. For example, the debt could also be serviced in kind, by taking part in reconstruction, in the creation of jobs, and so on. Or, if we do secede from the Soviet Union, and if they ask us for something, then we can calmly present them with the Chernobyl bill, saying, "Gentlemen, we have already paid for everything...."

Ukraine on 'Operation Visla' Condemnation

91P50037 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 12 Oct 90 p 3

["Statement of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic on the Decree of the Senate of the Polish Republic on 3 August 1990 concerning 'Operation Visla'"—PRAVDA UKRAINY headline]

[Text] (Kiev, 9 October) The Ukrainian people have welcomed with understanding the decree of the Senate of the Polish Republic of 3 August 1990 concerning the condemnation of "Operation Visla," sanctioned by the Polish post-war government and carried out in 1947.

"Operation Visla" destroyed the ethnic integrity of the Ukrainians in the Polish People's Republic.

The Ukrainians suffered huge human, material, and spiritual losses. They were violently resettled, dispersed, and deprived of their homes, property, cultural and educational institutions, and their churches. They lost any possibility of enjoying a fully equal national life and to this day they feel the consequences of such a tragedy.

The Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] sees the Senate's recognition of the illegal nature of "Operation Visla" as a serious step toward correcting the injustices inflicted on the Ukrainians in Poland. We realize that, due to long mutual misunderstanding, the Poles also suffered great sadness and suffering at the hands of the Ukrainians. We also condemn the monstrous crimes of the Stalinist regime against the Poles.

The Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR expresses the certainty that, with common efforts, the Ukrainians and Poles can overcome the consequences of the tragic past and lay the basis for a new stage in the relations between our peoples and states.

Caucasus

'Major Changes' Awaited in Georgian Government

LD1411120990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1030 GMT 14 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Albert Kochetkov]

[Text] Tbilisi, 14 Nov (TASS)—The first session of the Georgia Supreme Soviet, which began in the capital of this Transcaucasian republic today, has accepted the resignation of the government and instructed it to fulfill its duties until a new Council of Ministers is formed.

The deputies to the legislature, elected on a multiparty basis, have to pass a package of draft laws that is directed toward achieving sovereignty and independence for Georgia and restoring its statehood. Although it is not up to the current session to confirm the republic's new emblems, the crimson, black, and white flag which Georgia had before joining the USSR 69 years ago has already been raised today over the government building.

The draft law on the proclamation of a transitional period in the Republic of Georgia [Respublika Gruziya], which is what it is expected to be called henceforth, will set the program. It envisages major changes in Georgia's existing Constitution. In particular, sections will be excluded from the basic law on articles and phrases such as "communist," "socialist," "soviet," and "revolution". The supremacy of the Georgian republic laws over the USSR's laws is envisaged in the altered Constitution.

The election of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet chairman also began today. The most likely contender for this post is Zviyad Gamsakhurdiya, leader of the "Free Georgia Roundtable" political bloc, which was a long way ahead of the republican communist party in the elections.

Gamsakhurdiya Elected President

LD1411134590 Moscow TASS in English 1331 GMT 14 Nov 90

[By SAKARTVELO-TASS correspondent Tengiz Grigalas Vili]

[Text] Tbilisi November 14 TASS—The newly-elected Georgian parliament at its first session today elected well-known Georgian author and scholar Zviyad Gamsakhurdiya, 51, to be the republican president.

He leads the Roundtable-Free Georgia Bloc which won the recent general elections in the republic.

Paper on Political Alignment After Georgia Poll

PM1311232590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Nov 90 First Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Kaushanskiy report under "Direct Line" rubric: "Who Is in Opposition Today?"]

[Text] Tbilisi—Sunday 11 November was runoff election day in the 66 Georgian electoral districts where candidate deputies of the republic's Supreme Soviet will continue to run for election in person. As the SAKARTVELO news agency reported, after the first round the electoral bloc "Roundtable—Free Georgia" had the largest number of contenders for deputies' seats with 48 candidate deputies, while the Georgian Communist Party had 34. Twelve independents, 11 representatives of the Georgian People's Front, 5 representatives of the "Freedom" bloc, three each from the All-Georgia Rustaveli Society and the "Democratic Georgia" bloc, and one from the "Accord, Peace, Rebirth" bloc are also competing for seats in the new legislature.

In view of these figures it is clear to see that the very concept of "opposition" has undergone substantial changes in Georgia's political life today. Z. Gamsakhurdia, leader of the "Roundtable" and chairman of the Helsinki alliance, who just yesterday was considered primus inter pares in the opposition to the republic's current leadership, now represents the majority in the legislature and is receiving congratulatory telegrams on his victory in the Supreme Soviet elections. One such telegram came from A. Ruutel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet. But the Communists, who through the will of fate have become the legislative partners of the "Roundtable," are preparing to regroup their ranks. A conference was held at the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee recently to discuss the question of preparing and holding the second stage [tur] of the 18th republic Communist Party congress. Its program guidelines and organizational-structural formation are to be decided in the very near future. Let us recall that Gamsakhurdia stated in an interview that there will be no obstacles in the parliamentary work of the Georgian Communist Party only if it leaves the CPSU.

Meanwhile, after the first sitting on 14 November, the multiparty legislature, the first in the republic's history, will have to determine its attitude toward the National Congress, another force in opposition to the "Roundtable" and not a former opposition but a real one. I. Tsereteli, one of its more radical leaders, stated when addressing a session of this organ's organizational collegium that the question of mutual relations with the newly elected Supreme Soviet will largely depend on the status that the latter gives itself and Georgia. The stance of the National Congress radicals is clear: Georgia is a territory occupied and annexed after aggression by a neighboring state. It is this status which the republic should be given by its new legislature which, in the "intransigents'" opinion, is itself the organ of self-management of an occupied country. The National Congress, according to repeated statements by its representatives, sees itself as the organ of that country's national liberation movement.

Such is the terminology. Such are the conditions of cooperation or, rather, confrontation between the legislature and the congressmen. The latter, incidentally, at the aforementioned organizational collegium session,

considered it expedient to continue the boycott of the army of occupation, that is, the Soviet Army.

Georgian Army Society Changes Name, Purpose

LD1011070190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Text] The DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy] of Georgia has been renamed as the Georgian Society for the Promotion of the Army. Not only has the name been changed, but also the aim of the society. From now on it becomes a national and military and patriotic organization, that is, its main task is to prepare cadres for the future national army formations.

Armenia Abolishes People's Control Committee

LD1311220490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Text] The Armenian Supreme Soviet has adopted a decision abolishing the republican People's Control Committee. The document makes it incumbent on the Constitutional Commission to submit proposals on the introduction of changes to the Armenian Constitution.

Yerevan Paper Sees Bleak Future for Armenia

NC1311153090 Yerevan HAYASTAN in Armenian 25 Oct 90 p 1

[Article by Patvakan Shakaryan under the "Political Diary" rubric: "The Union is Falling Apart. What Are We Doing in the Meantime?"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] Recently I met an old acquaintance of mine. Without greeting each other or engaging in any smalltalk, we immediately started discussing the condition of the country.

"Guess what Gorbachev has on his mind?" asked my acquaintance.

"The same thing that you have on your mind," I replied.

My acquaintance asked soberly: "Is the Union going to collapse?"

My acquaintance's concern was warranted but he had not chosen the right word. This huge country is not just going to collapse but rather it is going to fall apart, or, to be more exact, it is already falling apart and with every passing day and hour the dividing lines are becoming more accentuated. Geographically, the Soviet republics have remained located in the same place, but politically, in terms of differences and objectives, they are veering away from each other at an amazing rate, thus escaping seventy years of despotism, hypocrisy, and debasement. No matter how bitter it is to admit, Armenia has once again suffered and been pillaged the most.

That strong power whose protection the Armenians sought has, by an evil trick of fate, taken sides not with the victim but with the executioner. The powerful Union not only does not assist the ancient Christian state, but rather, contrary to sound logic, contributes in every way possible to consolidating the pan-Turkish forces. [passage omitted]

This huge country is falling apart from the strong political tremors and little Armenia is the smallest quiver of all. Our lands and our vital territories have been forcibly occupied, our cities and villages have been ruined by the earthquake, our economy has disintegrated, and our faith is shattered. Compared to the other Soviet republics, our situation is indisputably the worst and I fear (though I hope I am mistaken in my political predictions) that tomorrow will be even worse. [passage omitted]

Everything possible must be done to speedily revive the economy, to forcefully advance the sciences (after all, most of the republic's leaders represent the sciences or are scientists), and to strengthen the republic's defenses. We should neither panic at the sight of the enemy nor remain unconcerned, thinking that the enslavement of the people or the genocide are things of the past. Both attitudes are dangerous, though the latter attitude is the most dangerous. [passage omitted]

This huge country is falling apart. And what does Gorbachev have on his mind? Now he is busy receiving congratulations for his Nobel prize. In fact, President Gorbachev extinguished the fires of the Afghan war and gave security guarantees to the West. Europe and the U.S. were satisfied with these results and they expressed their thanks through awarding him this most prestigious prize. Who cares about the problems inside the country, about the sufferings of the Armenians, in particular of Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast], and the other small nations and peoples? For Europe and the U.S. these are secondary and less important issues which could either be solved later or would solve themselves in accordance with the millennium-old correlation between the weak and the strong. That is why all our hopes pinned on outsiders are in vain. Only we can stand on our feet through our own extraordinary efforts, exerted at this very moment, on this very day. [passage omitted]

Truly, what does Gorbachev have on his mind? The best reply to that could only come from Gorbachev himself. But it is beyond a doubt that he, who has lost many opportunities at hand, is hoping that the country will make the transition to a market economy and that everyone will engross themselves in business and in acquiring wealth, and that in this political polyphony everyone will forget about their national interests and will live, say, like in the United States. But I do not think that that will come to pass. Unlike the United States, this country is not a melting pot of nationalities but an enforced union of historically developed independent states which is already falling apart.

Armenian Nationalist Leader Returns to Yerevan

NC1211143390 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1000 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Report by Gevorg Nazaryan: "Paruyr Ayrikyan Returns to the Fatherland"]

[Excerpts] Paruyr Ayrikyan, Armenian Supreme Soviet people's deputy and founder of the National Self-Determination Association, was to have returned to the fatherland yesterday. However, the people who had gathered to welcome him were disappointed as he could not manage to arrive in Yerevan before 1040 today. He was welcomed with flowers and greetings. [passage omitted]

We asked Paruyr Ayrikyan to make a statement to our listeners:

[Begin recording] I am here on the soil of the fatherland at last. Much needs to be done and the people have expectations [words indistinct]. These expectations entail certain responsibilities which I think I am ready to bear. I have not returned to Armenia to struggle against anyone. I think that [words indistinct] if one is on the side of truth, then the people will support you, and if the people are with you, then you cannot have opponents. I hope that our struggle will be against foreign opponents and not against those at home who have lost their way [words indistinct]. [end recording) [passage omitted]

To Address Rally

PM1311113590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[INTERFAX report: "P. Ayrikyan Comes to Yerevan"]

[Text] Paruyr Ayrikyan, one of the leaders of the Karabakh movement, who was stripped of Soviet citizenship and expelled from the USSR, is coming to Yerevan 11 November. P. Ayrikyan was elected to the Armenian Supreme Soviet this year, but he has not yet participated in its work at all. As an INTERFAX correspondent reports, after arriving in Yerevan P. Ayrikyan will visit the tomb of Movses Georgisyan, who died during Armenian-Azerbaijani clashes. A rally with P. Ayrikyan's participation is scheduled for tomorrow.

News Agency Expanding Ties With Diaspora

NC1311135290 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Yerevan, 12 Nov (ARMENPRES)—Zhirayr Arutyunyan, the representative of the "Armenian Assembly of America," is a member of the U.S. delegation taking part in a recent Soviet-American conference on radio and television in Moscow. He visited Armenia for a few days.

As part of his contacts to become acquainted with life in the republic, he visited Armenia's state news agency ARMENPRES where he was received by Levon Manukyan, ARMENPRES deputy director.

They discussed expanding news services between the diaspora and the fatherland. It was particularly noted that efforts should be made to exchange news between ARMENPRES and influential foreign news agencies. The guest was informed that in the future, experimental transmissions will be sent to the British news agency REUTERS.

Recently, links with the diaspora news centers have substantially increased. ARMENPRES is sending news through direct telex lines to South and North America, Greece, France, England, and other countries.

Raffi Ovanesyan, the representative in Yerevan of the "Armenian Assembly of America," and Vanik Santryan, director of the ARMENPRES' information section for diaspora Armenian press, participated in the meeting.

Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan Meets Catholicos

NC1211124890 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 11 Nov 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The papers report that Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian republic's Supreme soviet, received Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of all the Armenians Vazgen I.

The catholicos was received at the entrance of the Armenian Supreme Soviet by the chairman of the Armenian legislature; Babken Ararktsyan, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet; Gagik Arutyunyan, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet; and members of the Supreme Soviet Presidium and people's deputies.

In greeting the catholicos, Levon Ter-Petrosyan noted that this meeting is a token of support for the Armenian Supreme Soviet and the policies it pursues and marks the beginning of extremely important cooperation in forging the new state. Today the church must be considered the most important component of our nation, for it is the foundation of morality and faith, he said.

The catholicos conveyed the greetings and blessings of the Mother See Holy Edzhmiatsin to the chairman of the Armenian legislature, his deputies, and all those who support the policy pursued by the Armenian authorities. He referred to a number of problems facing the Armenian Apostolic church. He lamented that at present the Armenian church lacks the necessary servants who could accomplish their mission both in Armenia and among the world's Armenians.

During the meeting it was pointed out that the parliament will soon debate a bill on freedom of conscience and the church.

[Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian at 1730 GMT on 10 November carries a similar item which adds that

Levon Ter-Petrosyan praised the role of the church and said the government's "policy is to separate church and state completely, though that does not mean a lack of concern for the church's problems." He "also enumerated those practical spheres where the state and church should cooperate, such as the joint formulation of the bill on freedom of conscience." The Armenian catholicos handed Ter-Petrosyan "a draft law on freedom of conscience prepared by the Edzhmiatsin synod and hoped that the church's representatives would also take part in the work of the Supreme Soviet's standing commissions which are drawing up the bill. The proposal was welcomed."]

CP Criticized For Opposing Depoliticization

NC0911085190 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 7 Nov 90

[Report by Mavr Danielyan: "The Party is Complaining"]

[Excerpts] It is difficult to take a pen and to write against a paper which bears the name HAYASTAN [Armenia—the organ of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee] and whose editors and thousands of readers are a part of us and who were with us when we raised our fists at the rallies and began the course of the national liberation struggle.

If you would believe the paper, the Communists are united with the people and are struggling for the creation of the independent state of Armenia. I understand the assurances given by the paper, but what I cannot understand are those tens of thousands of Communists who still pin hopes on the Communist Party. I have been in the ranks of that party for 35 years, and only in the last six months or so have I escaped its fetters. Now, speaking for tens of thousands of Communists, the paper attempts to ensure that it stands on the side of the people in these trying days for the Armenian people and says that it is elated at seeing the people's ideological advancement, the democratic parliament, and the declaration of independence. Yet, today on 7 November, on the party's festival day, an item appeared on the front page of the holiday issue of HAYASTAN revealing the essence of the Communist Party. It was a declaration of the 29th Armenian Communist Party Congress Presidium concerning one of our Supreme Soviet's decisions. We have struggled for this decision for decades, and it was endorsed by our legislature with great enthusiasm.

The congress presidium was enraged at the fact that a decision has been made to depoliticize the Armenian Republic's state bodies, enterprises, institutions, organizations, educational establishments, and military subunits and to end the activities of the party and sociopolitical organizations in these organs.

In fact, this was a long-awaited and historically ripe—even over-ripe—decision. Then why has it engendered such rage? Our republic is proceeding toward a multiparty system, and this is not a matter for the future. There are already a few parties. Why is it that from among these only the Communist Party is angered? What has it to lose by this decision? Yes, this is the essence of the issue: What has it to lose by this decision?

The congress Presidium pretends to have forgotten, and thinks all others have forgotten, that the party document declares the following: No matter where a member of the Communist Party works, be it in the Committee for State Security, in a firm, Council of Ministers, ordinary establishment, academy, school, or army unit, he must implement the decisions and the policy of the Communist Party.

Esteemed congress presidium: What will the situation look like if under conditions of a multiparty system every party keeps primary party organizations, as in the Academy of Sciences or in the Internal Affairs Ministry, and struggles only for its own policies? What will then happen to the decisions of our legislature, to our declaration of independence and Constitution? [passage omitted]

Here is what the statement demands at the end: The Armenian Communist Party proposes to suspend the implementation of the Supreme Soviet decision on the depoliticization of the state organs, enterprises, and other institutions.

It is clear the intention is to to secure the activities of the party organizations in these institutions and to disrupt the implementation of the decisions of the democratic legislature.

We hope that the legislature will not heed your good advice.